The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1932 NUMBER 896

Contents

The Week 305

Editorials

- The Reparations Deadlock..... 308
- Behind the Scenes at Geneva..... 309
- Another Judge Parker..... 310

General Articles

- What's Stopping Birth Control?.....James Rorty 312
- Big Navy Boys: III.....Charles A. Beard 314
- Washington Notes.....T. R. B. 318
- Two Events.....Stark Young 319
- Wheat in Winter (verse).....Martha Keller 321
- The Superrealists.....Matthew Josephson 321
- The Praying Mantis.....Moe Bragin 322

Correspondence 323

Reviews of Books

- Manifesto to the Trade.....Malcolm Cowley 326
- Woodrow Wilson: A Retouched Portrait..... .....Charles Seymour 327
- Policy or Knight-Errantry?.....Herman Simpson 328
- Shoddy and Pure Wool.....Lewis Mumford 329
- A Shy Communicant.....Gerald Sykes 329
- Mirror of Girlhood.....Hazel Hawthorne 329
- Book Notes..... 330

The Week

WHILE the country is waiting, with various degrees of hope, for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to get under way and show just what it amounts to, the situation of the unemployed grows daily more desperate. About one-quarter of the nation's workers are now without jobs; with their dependents, they probably constitute at least a sixth, perhaps a fifth, of the whole population. As the months of unemployment have lengthened, private savings have been used up, and assistance by relatives or neighbors has become increasingly difficult, or impossible. Private charity has responded as well as could be expected, but has fallen far short of meeting the need. Public funds in many cities and towns are also exhausted, and there is no way of increasing them. In many rural sections the suffering is acute, and it is equally so in certain industrial areas such as the coal-mining regions in Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Kentucky.

EVEN our largest and richest communities are not exempt. In New York City, where the authorities and their own failure to cope with it, only half of the 250,000 destitute families (embracing about a million persons) are receiving more than the most negligible aid. In Chicago, half a million people are being aided by public charity which must come to an end *next week* unless new funds are found. A special session of the state legislature has been called, which it is hoped will authorize a bond issue of $20,000,000 for this purpose. Meanwhile, policemen, firemen, school teachers are going unpaid and drastic economies are being instituted in every direction. In many other cities the situation is about as bad. In the recent hearings on unemployment relief before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Manufactures one expert witness after another, including such men as Allen T. Burns, executive director of the Association of Community Chests and Councils, William Hodson, executive director of the Welfare Council of New York, Jacob Billikopf, executive director of the Federation of Jewish Charities of Philadelphia, and many others, appeared to testify that all available public and private funds, combined, would not be sufficient to give even the irreducible minimum of needed relief this winter. Among them were several men who have always opposed federal aid, and until a few weeks ago believed that it could be avoided. They have changed their minds.

THE hearings were held to consider two bills, introduced by Senators Costigan and La Follette, which provided federal appropriations to prevent starvation. These two bills have now been withdrawn and a joint substitute offered (S.3045). It would set aside $375,000,000 for this purpose, of which not more than 40 percent would be distributed among the states on a population basis, subject to the requirement that no state should receive an amount greater than two-thirds of its own relief expenditures. The other 60 percent would be available for emergency assistance wherever needed, including aid to migratory workers who are now, more or less, left to starve. While a federal board would supervise these operations during the life of the law (two years) all expenditures would be made locally, through existing channels. The New Republic believes that this bill should be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strated, and it is nonsense to say that it must be met locally when it is evident that this is impossible. In the opinion of the experts, the choice is now federal aid or starvation.

GERMANY has obtained another "breathing spell"; and again one is forced to ask, "What for?" We agree with Senator Borah who says that more postponement is like delaying an operation until the patient is too weak to survive it. The "standstill" agreement in regard to one and a half billion dollars of short-term credits, which expired on February 29, has now been continued for one year, subject, however, to possible earlier action by the creditor countries. The reparations conference which was to have been held at Lausanne this week has been postponed for at least three months, due to the obvious impossibility of reconciling the French and German—and American—positions. Germany, through Herr Brüning, announces that she can pay no more reparations and wants the whole matter ended. France, through M. Laval, says that reparations will not be readjusted without a similar adjustment in the war debts to America. America, through the State Department, holds the old legalistic position that war debts and reparations are not related, and through the congressional debates reveals a discouraging outlook for proposals looking toward cancellation of the debts. In the background is the immovable fact that, in the present state of world depression plus tariffs, no nation can pay much, and some can pay nothing.

MEANWHILE Brüning is frantically seeking a way out of a desperate situation. After the failure of his proposal to Adolf Hitler to extend President Hindenburg's term by a two-thirds majority vote in the Reichstag without a popular election, a proposal which the Fascist leader answered in a vitriolic letter given to the American press before Brüning himself could publish it in Germany, a new effort is now being made to circumnavigate the crisis. The government parties are asking for a political truce "for the rebuilding of the fatherland" which would suspend all elections in 1932, on the argument that a united Germany would be its own best advocate in the coming negotiations with the Allied Powers. It is possible that such a suspension may be obtained by an emergency decree under Article 48 of the Constitution, but a truce thus arrived at would be more apparent than real. The "National Bloc," the Communist party and the rapidly growing Socialist Labor party will continue their determined opposition. And in fact, abrogation of the Prussian state election might provoke the much feared Fascist "putsch," which would inevitably precipitate a retaliatory general strike of organized labor, shattering the illusion of unity before the entire world. It is clear that Brüning's stand against

CAN a boycott be broken by force of arms? That is what the Japanese are trying to do in their present action against China. Japanese gunboats are lying off the native city of Shanghai and, as we go to press, active hostilities are expected at any moment. A series of resignations has left the Nanking government almost incapable of action, but in any case it is hard to see how the Japanese demand could be accepted and enforced, since no power can compel private citizens to buy goods they do not want. Foreign observers are beginning to believe that Japan intends to seize and hold the entire Yangtse Valley, the heart of China; and it is certain that she would like to take Tsingtao, which she held for some time after the War, and occupied for a few hours one day last week. Both the unwillingness and the inability of the rest of the world to stop Japan were long ago painfully apparent. Neither Great Britain nor France associated itself with Mr. Stimson's protest based on the Kellogg Pact and the Nine Power Treaty, and the Foreign Offices of these two Powers are notoriously pro-Japanese. The League of Nations has suffered one defeat after another, and has been only partially successful in its usual device of laying the blame on the United States. Geneva observers report that Manchuria is regarded, by France in particular, as just a bargaining point against America in the coming Arms Conference. France will uphold America's position in the Far East if we prove amenable in regard to reduction of war debts and non-reduction of armament.

IS Spain, like Russia, destined to go Communist? Last week an effort was made to establish a soviet regime; it was put down, but not crushed; and as we go to press, a nationwide general strike is beginning, with revolutionary purposes behind it. The present government is rapidly losing support among the workers because of its "Kerenskyism"—weakness, vacillation and reluctance to live up to its pledges. It must be forced into every decisive step. Thus, the new decree dissolving the Jesuit order comes after the burning of the churches and convents. The bill giving the workers an important degree of control in the larger factories was extorted from the government by the strike of the Barcelona port workers. The Civil Guard, which is something of an autonomous Fascist organization, will probably be sharply curbed as a result of the assassination of a group of its members in Castilblanco. The question always is, with a country in a position like that of Spain today, whether the moderate revolutionary government can move to the Left fast enough to satisfy the rapidly growing radicalism of the proletariat.

THE bill to strengthen the banking system introduced by Senator Glass gives evidence of having been framed with the aid of disinterested expert

LICENSED TO NYZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scribed in short space, but it calls for a number of what seem to be desirable changes. An instrument is created for the prompt liquidation of closed banks. More rigorous inspection is provided for, not merely of single banks, but of groups and chains. Branch banking is permitted to national banks within states which accord that privilege to state banks. A device is created to make possible a consistent open-market policy by all the Federal Reserve banks, through an open-market committee having supervision over this matter. At present the twelve central banks are largely independent of one another as to this important means of controlling credit, and they have, according to all reports, frequently been at odds concerning the policy to be pursued. The Federal Reserve Board is made responsible for international credit dealings—a matter which in the past has been handled largely by the New York bank alone. Measures are proposed to supervise the activities of investment affiliates of commercial banks. And a number of devices are included to curb the use of credit in speculation—including a bar to brokers' loans by non-banking corporations. We do not know whether the greater degree of centralization provided for in this bill will actually lead to the adoption of sounder policies, but at least it will place the responsibility somewhere, and make necessary calculated decisions of some sort. That is the first requirement for having any real policy at all.

THE Seabury Committee which has been investigating corruption in New York City has issued an interim report on its achievements up to date, made timely by the fact that the state legislature must now decide whether to continue the investigation for another year. The report repeats the evidence, which has been presented from day to day, that numerous high officials of the city were found to be in personal possession of sums running into millions of dollars, for which they could give no reasonable explanation. It is absurd to claim, as Assemblyman Louis A. Cuvillier does in his pathetically incompetent reply on behalf of Tammany, that the Seabury investigation has dealt merely with the private lives of public men; the only possible way to reveal what is going on is to begin by showing where the loot went, and how much it amounted to. Judge Seabury expects, when his work is completed, to make specific and far-reaching suggestions for the reorganization and simplification of New York's city government, including, probably, administration by experts divorced from politics, under some form of "city manager" plan. We wish him Godspeed in his efforts; and certainly the fine piece of work the committee has done thus far provides an excellent groundwork for such a reorganization. Yet it is discouraging to see the indifference displayed by so many citizens over these revelations. Never was Tammany more shameless in its endeavors to hang onto the swag, keep mum and wait till the storm blows over; and never did its policy seem better adapted to the apathetic or cynical mood of the public.

AS WE write, the outcome of the wage conference between the railroad executives and the unions hangs in the balance. So far, the outstanding feature of the negotiations has been the obduracy of the executives. They demand a wage cut, ostensibly to save the railroads which are in financial difficulties. In other words, they want that part of railroad labor which is still employed to give a dole to unemployed railroad capital. The unions have been willing to discuss the question on the chance that if they should grant a voluntary "deduction," something definite might be done to improve employment conditions and furnish greater security in the future. But to almost every proposal of the men a negative response has been forthcoming. The executives will not pool the savings from wage cuts for the benefit of the roads which really need it to avoid default on bonds; thus the dole would not even accomplish its ostensible purpose, but would contribute to the profits of the companies which do not need it to avoid receivership. The executives will not explicitly promise complete union recognition. They have, as one union chairman expressed it, "practically thrown our three-year employment-stabilization program out of the window." About the only concession so far made on the part of management is agreement to a joint committee to study retirement insurance, elective workmen's compensation and a dismissal wage, and to report promptly. The sum and substance of the matter is that the representatives of the bankers and railroad owners intend to take advantage of the depression to enforce lower wages, regardless of the effect on the wage earners.

IN The New Republic of July 1, 1931, we commented on the dismissal of Dr. Ray Hall, economic expert in the United States Department of Commerce. Dr. Hall, it will be remembered, charged, in substance, that he was dismissed because he insisted on publication of facts which were at variance with the official theories of the Hoover administration. At the request of Secretary Lamont, the American Economic Association appointed a committee to investigate the case, and its report has just been made public. The committee considers six charges made by Dr. Hall and, in general, sustains the Department. It considers his method of seeking a complete balance of international payments "of doubtful validity . . . too hastily conceived and applied." It believes deletions made in his manuscript were "justified" and charges Dr. Hall with "serious impropriety" in quoting from his own writings, published under a pseudonym, as though they were the work of an independent authority. Dr. Hall complained that his references to the tariff and prohibition had been deleted, and the committee suggests that the Department

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

footnote signed with Dr. Hall's initials. As to the tariff, without making a specific suggestion, it finds in the Department "undue timidity" about factual material on this and similar subjects, and deplores the belief that "in official publications, references to the tariff should be avoided if possible." The committee praises Dr. Hall's scientific achievements, but declines to criticize his dismissal. It is fair, we think, to say that the report finds Dr. Hall wrong on specific points, but right in principle. It confirms the idea that the Department is not a fearless, independent and scientific body, but is one which trims its sails to the political winds.

THERE has recently been a good deal of advertising ballyhoo to the effect that a revival of the automobile industry is about to lead us out of the depression. This industry, the argument runs, is an important customer for steel, glass, electrical equipment, etc., etc. During the depression a lot of people have been letting their cars wear out, and the need for replacement will call forth new orders. Therefore automobile manufacturers will be active and in turn will stimulate the rest of industry. Let us see what this hope amounts to. There are in use approximately 25,000,000 cars and trucks in the United States. Assume that the average life of both is seven years (though we suspect, from cars seen on the road, that this period is capable of indefinite extension). Let us further assume that for every car scrapped someone has enough money to buy a new one (though that probably isn't true). The annual replacement demand would then be something under 3,600,000 (under, because we have not had 25,000,000 cars for more than two years). But, in the depression year 1930, the industry turned out, in the United States, 3,355,986 cars. If everything turns out as well as hoped, therefore, the automobile stimulus will be about as helpful as in the first year of depression.

FOR more than ten years, The New Republic has been urging that judges and juries in criminal courts should have the assistance of expert psychiatrists. As everyone knows, a large proportion of all persons arrested for crime are mentally deficient in greater or less degree. The law does not as a rule hold a six-year-old child responsible for his acts, as it would an adult. Why should it do so in the case of a six-year-old mind which happens to be encased in a full-grown body? What ought to be done, of course, is for judge and jury to establish the facts as to the transgression; and for judge and psychiatrist, in consultation, then to determine what degree and character of punishment or treatment is appropriate to each case. We are glad to note that an approximation of this urgently needed reform has just been put into effect in New York City. A clinic, directed by Dr. Menas S. Gregory, head of the division of psychiatry of the Department of Hospitals, has been established in connection with [illegible] person—the number reaches some 4,000 annually—will be carefully examined and a report on his mental state and history will be in the hands of the trial judge before sentence is passed. This reform, of course, will not solve the "problem of crime," which is rooted in our whole social and economic system. Nevertheless, it is an important step. New York, which has so little to be proud of under the mis-, mal- and non-administration of Jimmie Walker, is now entitled to emit a feeble and embarrassed cheer of self-gratulation.

The Reparations Deadlock

SENATOR Borah's recent statement opposing extension of the Hoover moratorium (and of course, though he does not mention it, permanent cancellation of debts) expresses an opinion widely held in the United States. France, he says, as indicated by Premier Laval's recent speech, is obstructing European rehabilitation by demanding full payment of reparations, maintenance of the sanctity of the peace treaties and the retention of present armaments. As long as this is so, what interest has the United States in extending a helping hand? France must come to her senses before anything can be offered.

We agree with Mr. Borah regarding the harm done, and likely still to be done, by the intransigent position of France. But we do not understand what pressure the United States can exert upon France by allowing it to be believed that under no conditions shall we remit the Allied debts to us. Europe is convinced that we shall insist upon collecting, no matter what happens. That is now one of the fixed points of popular opinion abroad. And that opinion is one of the most useful weapons in M. Laval's armory. He can say to the French people, to the Germans, to Great Britain, to the whole world, "How can we be lenient to Germany, since we must pay America? It is said that France obstructs economic recovery, political security, disarmament. But, plainly, that is not so. We cannot move, because America ties our hands. She insists upon payment. She will not guarantee peace. We are compelled, therefore, to demand payment ourselves and to keep up our army to enforce our rights."

While the United States waits for France to do something, France waits, ostensibly, for the United States to do something. Thus American obstinacy becomes the stalking horse of the Quai d'Orsay. Under the shadow of this excuse, France stands on her legal rights in relation to Germany. No doubt her financiers and statesmen are perfectly well aware that some modification of those rights must in the end be made. But, meanwhile, they constitute an excellent trading point in dealing with the Germans and the British. Everyone is weaker than before, everyone is in danger, but France is not so weak and not so close to danger as Germany, and [illegible] Great Britain. This is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

therefore the historical moment in which to establish permanently French supremacy on the Continent, at whatever temporary cost. If French interests can acquire a sufficiently dominating position in German industry and in Central European trade, and if a guarantee can be had of the abandonment of all ambitions to revise the Treaty of Versailles, the right to reparations may be sold for these concessions, and the jam unblocked.

As long as the United States declines to consider the possibility of debt revision, as long as it refuses to participate in the discussion of world economic problems, the hand of France is strengthened in pursuing this disastrous policy. America furnishes the alibi, it remains the scapegoat, for the suffering occasioned by the existing deadlock. We surrender the trading value of our own legal claim to the war debts by failing to set any price on it at all. Such hints as Senator Borah passes out, of a possibly milder attitude in case France consents to be good, are of no effect abroad. There is all too much evidence that we intend to demand our pound of flesh in any case. And these hints can have no influence whatever on the official policy of France, since, for present purposes, those who direct that policy wish nothing better than that we should remain obdurate.

If Senator Borah and those who agree with him about the policy of France really want to influence the course of events in the direction which they approve, they should state their terms positively. Are they willing to offer cancellation of debts in return for cancellation of reparations and a policy of cooperation in Europe? Can they commit our government to this pledge? Will they bring the President to the point of making a statement to this effect, or of sending a delegation to negotiate such a settlement? If so, they can call M. Laval's bluff. They can put him in a position where he must either change his course or cease blaming us for it. They can confront him with the choice between surrender and isolation. If they cannot do this, or will not, they lay themselves open to the accusation of bluffing. They can be charged with utilizing the assumed wickedness of France in order to protect the intransigence of the United States.

M. Laval must smile if he reads any of the fulminations in this country against allowing the wicked European statesmen to pull the wool over our eyes. For the wool has now been put deftly in place. It is securely held there by the very Americans who express the greatest fear of the wily foreigner. It prevents us from seeing how we obstruct European settlement to the advantage, not of ourselves, but merely of French official policy. For, in the end, reparations and war debts cannot be paid anyway, no matter how obdurate we may be. Our influence is exerted, in reality, only to postpone the final settlement. And postponement is just what France needs in order to wear down the resistance of her opponents. The longer we refuse to move, the better chance she h[illegible] ever hard bargain she has in mind. America takes the blame—and will not get the money.

Behind the Scenes at Geneva

NEXT WEEK plenipotentiaries of all the sovereign states of the world assemble at Geneva to negotiate limitation of armaments. Hardly anyone is optimistic enough to think they will succeed. Here in America there is a common conviction that armaments exist for only two reasons: (a) the desire of admirals and generals to wear funny uniforms and (b) the lobbying activities such as those of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation and Mr. William B. (Big Bass Drum) Shearer. Governmental reluctance to disarm seems wicked and senseless.

Experts know differently. If the Geneva Conference fails, it will not be solely because of generals and admirals and governmental perversity; there are some real, concrete obstacles to disarmament. There is, however, no government—including the government of Mr. Hoover—which has ever had the frankness and courage to mention them. What governments will not say is that the problem before the Geneva Conference is not the problem of disarmament, properly speaking, at all, but the problem of the future imperialistic control of eastern Europe and China. These are the real obstacles to disarmament. If any actual disarming were to take place at Geneva, the status quo in eastern Europe and China would be immediately and profoundly altered. Every diplomatico at Geneva knows this, but none would ever say so without endless circumlocution.

The problem of eastern Europe is a good century old. Metternich, Gladstone, Bismarck, all tried to solve it. It produced the Crimean War in 1855, and was the direct cause of the World War in 1914. France is now dominant in eastern Europe. France is dominant principally because of one thing—the French army. Why, for example, is French influence all-powerful at Warsaw? Not because of France's loans. Poland could have obtained money in London or New York on far easier terms. Not because of advantageous markets for Polish exports. Poland's natural markets are in Germany and Soviet Russia. Poland clings to France because France is militarily the strong nation of Europe. The same thing is true of Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Jugoslavia.

Suppose France were to reduce its armaments. The moment the little states of eastern Europe lost assurance of France's military support, they would need to come to terms with Germany and Russia, and, in the case of Jugoslavia, to terms with Italy. The probability is that the day after France's decision to disarm, you would find M. Zaleski of Poland (very embarrassedly, for Poland recently has been giving itself pretentions to being a Great Power) crouched on the steps of the Wilhelmstrasse, wait-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benes of Czechoslovakia, weeping softly and contritely, and behind him, the dazed figure of Professor Jorga of Rumania. In Rome, the regicide, General Zhivkovic of Jugoslavia, would be found wriggling into the presence of Mussolini on his stomach.

From the Washington Conference in 1922 until last September, the status quo in China and Manchuria was maintained, even though precariously, by the joint threat of the American and British fleets. Last September England, because of its financial difficulties, the naval mutiny at Invergordon, the gathering unrest in India, was in effect partially disarmed. Japanese intervention in Manchuria promptly followed. But if England did not still possess its great naval base at Singapore and if America and England did not have in the "Colorado" and "Maryland," the "Nelson" and "Rodney," the four most efficient killing machines yet devised, does anyone suppose Japan would have proceeded even as gingerly as it has? That Japan would have waited five months, for instance, before landing marines at Shanghai?

These are the real problems before the Geneva Conference. Unless France reduces its army and America and England reduce their grotesquely swollen navies, it is hypocritical to talk of disarmament. But if France reduces its army, within a year or two Germany (always providing the depression lifts and that Germany is able to keep on terms of benevolent friendliness with Soviet Russia) will be completely dominant in eastern Europe, and on the road to becoming twice as powerful, and conceivably twice as belligerent, as it was before 1914. And if the United States and Britain give up their fleets, Japan will not improbably be ruler over China for the next generation, and possibly the next hundred years. This does not mean that disarmament is not desirable; but it does mean that disarmament is not likely to be achieved without a different attitude in every country toward the desirability of imperialism.

Perhaps no international issue since the crusades to the Holy Land has so seized people's imaginations, and stirred their sympathies, as has disarmament. Some 5,000,000 people in the United States, England, Holland and Germany have signed petitions which will be presented at Geneva within the next few days. Viscount Cecil is the accepted spokesman of the organized peace movement, and he has announced a program which leaves the nationalistic rivalries, the real cause of armaments, completely untouched.

Viscount Cecil's program calls for a 25-percent reduction in military expenditures and the abolition of warships of more than 10,000 tons, submarines, military airplanes and heavy artillery. A reduction of 25 percent in the French army budget would still permit France to have approximately three times as many men under arms as Germany has—not to mention France's 2,000,000 trained reservists. Germany would still be frustrated, vengeful and seeking secretly to re-arm. A 25-percent reduction in the American, British and Japanese fleets would leave each nation nearly as capable of offensive warfare as before. Commercial airplanes can be rapidly converted to military uses, and according to the lively Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond, capital ships of 5,000 tons would be as efficient, and practically as deadly, as the present 35,000-ton behemoths.

The maddening thing about the Geneva Conference is that among its delegates must be perhaps two dozen professional diplomaticos who, given a few hours' notice, could turn out perfectly workable plans for genuine disarmament. The problems of eastern Europe and China are not insoluble. The commercial and financial interests of the Great Powers in eastern Europe and China, in so far as they are at all legitimate, are generally compatible. In the Bank of International Settlements and the League Finance Committee are handy, and neutral, instruments to enforce whatever solutions might be devised. But, seemingly, no diplomatico is ever ready to give up imperialistic, greedy policies and plottings, nor the armies and navies needed to back them up, an accusation which may be made as justly against the Hoover administration and our supposedly national interests in the Far East as against any other nation. Diplomaticos might remember, however, that if the present Geneva Conference fails, it will almost certainly be a long time before another disarmament conference is called—perhaps not until after the next war. And peace advocates might remember that while parallel reduction of arms may help government budgets, it is not in itself a removal of the causes of war.

Another Judge Parker

ONE WONDERS whether Hoover is bent on illustrating in his own person the saying that the only thing one learns from history is that one does not learn anything from history. If ever an experience should have been conducive to presidential education, surely the rejection by the Senate of Judge Parker's nomination to the Supreme Court was such. Fundamentally, his nomination failed because of a deep conviction, in and out of the Senate, that he represented a dead generation, or, at the least, that the currents of modern life were not running through him. Perhaps Judge Parker was criticized too harshly upon his claim that in his decisions affecting labor he was merely following the compelling precedents of the Supreme Court. But what, then, is to be said of the President's act (to which we referred last week) in nominating to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Kenneth Mackintosh, who has rejected what the Supreme Court of the United States had defined as "the best

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions and adhered to the most extreme doctrine against trade unions anywhere in force in the United States?

This is precisely what happened in the case of Danz v. American Federation of Musicians, decided by the Supreme Court in Washington in 1925, in an opinion written by Judge Mackintosh. That case presented a typical industrial conflict between movie theatres and unions, in which the owners obtained an injunction whereby the unions were enjoined from all conduct except a very circumscribed opportunity for picketing. Specifically, the trial court permitted the unions to have observers stationed near theatre entrances "for the purpose of observing and reporting to their several unions for discipline any members of any union with whom the defendants" were affiliated, and also permitted one of these observers to wear a badge indicating the existence of a strike. But the observers, even the one with the badge, were forbidden to "address intending patrons." Even this very restrained opportunity for unions to carry out the abstractly recognized rights to strike appeared excessive to the Supreme Court of Washington, where the case went on appeal. Since our circuit courts of appeal are now increasingly important federal appellate tribunals and in labor disputes are frequently the final court, Judge Mackintosh's attitude becomes a matter of national concern. And this is what he said:

> Courts have expressed varying views upon the question of the legality of picketing, but the respondents in this action make no claim that picketing is always allowable and admit in their reply brief to the brief of *amicus curiae* that picketing is unlawful when coercive, but that otherwise picketing is lawful. What they mean is that picketing, to be enjoined, must be accompanied by violence in some degree. Support for this view may be found in the decisions of some courts, but this court has committed itself to a doctrine different than that contended for by the respondents and has declared all picketing unlawful, announcing that the term sometimes used of "peaceful picketing" is self-contradictory and meaningless, that picketing, in and of itself, is coercive and that that is its purpose and effect.

In so doing Judge Mackintosh went counter to the well known decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in American Foundries v. Tri-City Council. Though the Supreme Court doctrines, in labor cases, hold union activities by a very tight rein, Judge Mackintosh found even the Supreme Court not sufficiently drastic. Of course, Supreme Court decisions cannot be whistled down the wind, even when they are not binding upon state-court judges. And so Judge Mackintosh proceeded to "distinguish" the American Foundries case by finding provisions in the Clayton Act which did not have their analogues in Washington legislation. Unfortunately, the opinion of the Supreme Court as to peaceful pi[illegible]

any novelty introduced into federal law by the Clayton Act. It rested upon the decencies of what lawyers call equity procedure. In other words, the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States was a doctrine of moderation in the use of the labor injunction and avoidance of wholly one-sided intervention by the law in an industrial controversy. The opinion of the Supreme Court leaves no doubt on that score. As if to emphasize its authority, Chief Justice Taft was the Court's spokesman:

> It is clear that Congress wished to forbid the use by the federal courts of their equity arm to prevent peaceable persuasion by employees, discharged or expectant, in promotion of their side of the dispute, and to secure them against judicial restraint in obtaining or communicating information in any place where they might lawfully be. This introduces no new principle into the equity jurisprudence of those courts. It is merely declaratory of what was the best practice always. Congress thought it wise to stabilize this rule of action and render it uniform.

Congress, in 1914, formulated "what was the best practice always" as to the allowable limits of labor injunctions; the Supreme Court in 1921, recognizing that these practices have always been the best, fortified them by its sanction; the trial court in Washington applied this practice, but Judge Mackintosh in 1925 found the doctrine "self-contradictory and meaningless" and, on the plea of following earlier Washington cases, reverted to a doctrine of legal outlawry against labor, which had itself been outlawed in England fifty years ago.

One must assume that Judge Mackintosh's nomination was dictated by residual sentiments of college friendship—for Herbert Hoover and Kenneth Mackintosh are classmates—and that the President of the United States was not informed regarding the views which Kennth Mackintosh would carry to one of the highest courts in the land as an obstruction to modern social and economic forces long after Mr. Hoover will have left the White House. On the record, there is only one thing for the President to do. He should recall the nomination of Judge Mackintosh.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1932, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK ALVIN JOHNSON
E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES
R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What's Stopping Birth Control?

New York, Jan. 28.—The President's Organization for Unemployment Relief announces that among the emergency measures which it will initiate in the immediate future will be the rapid extension of birth-control clinics throughout the country. No serious legal obstacles are apprehended, since in forty-four states the law permits a physician to impart contraceptive information to his patient when and if, in his professional judgment, such information is proper and necessary. Hospital clinics, dispensaries and visiting-nurse associations are expected to provide the machinery for a rapid expansion of existing facilities, which are wholly inadequate. There are at present a hundred and one centers for contraceptive information operating in twenty-one states. During 1931 they served possibly a combined total of from 1,200 to 1,800 families per month; contrasted with this, there are, according to the most conservative estimate, over 2,000,000 families that are affected by the depression to the extent of requiring some measure of private or public relief. Relief workers report that in their struggle for survival the families they visit often rate contraceptive information as a need scarcely less essential than food, clothing and shelter; that their demands for contraceptive information are becoming increasingly insistent.

Opposition on religious grounds is expected, but this is discounted by the fact that the official position of the Catholic Church is contradicted by the action of Catholics generally, who have patronized existing birth-control clinics in a ratio corresponding almost exactly to the proportion of Catholics in the communities served; also by the fact that in the existing state of the laws, there is no need or occasion to make an immediate political issue of the matter.

THE ABOVE dispatch is of course wholly imaginary. But the facts which it embodies are as stated. Here are more facts, some of them culled from the actual press releases of welfare agencies closely affiliated with the President's Organization:

From the Welfare Council Coördinating Committee on Unemployment:—William Hodson, executive director of the Council, has recently made public an analysis showing that during the twelve months ending October 31 at least $40,000,000 was spent for relief by public and private agencies in New York City. Of the $18,000,000 spent for relief by public departments, exactly half, $9,012,004, was paid to widows with minor children, deserted mothers and other guardians of bereaved, abandoned or dependent children. These figures do not include children's agencies, many health agencies, visiting-nurse services and other miscellaneous welfare agencies.

From the Family Welfare Association of America:—In the first of a series of monthly summaries issued by the President's Organization for Unemployment Relief, issued December 10, it is stated that "practically all the family-welfare agencies participating in the inquiry report that their burdens during the past month are heavier than in October, 1930, because of increased requests for help and the exhaustion of family resources and credit." One society reports an increase of 300 percent in the families requesting help. "The overwhelming number of applicants in need of help makes it impossible in many cases for the agencies to do more than give relief, in spite of the fact that many other deep-seated family problems may be in evidence." (Birth control not mentioned.)

From the Family Welfare Association of America:—In a report on the organization and administration of public relief agencies undertaken at the request of the President's Organization for Unemployment Relief, and released December 7, it is stated that "the first aim of both public and private social welfare should be to foster programs whose purpose is the prevention of poverty. Systems of social insurance which attempt to equalize the burdens of individual hazards by the accumulation of special reserve funds which are set aside from normal income or production should receive careful consideration." (No mention of birth control.)

From The New York Times:—On December 6, The New York Times printed for the twentieth successive year its list of "One Hundred Neediest Cases, certified by nine great philanthropic organizations." The case histories are brief, but even a superficial analysis would indicate that in at least thirty-seven of these cases of actual or imminent starvation, improperly spaced children (many eminent obstetricians consider two years the minimum), tuberculous or otherwise diseased mothers, were in all probability major causative factors in bringing about the dependency of the family. In appealing for funds to help these cases, The Times says: "The purpose of this appeal is not temporary relief, but permanent rehabilitation. None of the Neediest Cases Fund is diverted to non-essentials; it pays for food or clothes or rent; for hospital or medical treatment; for the care of helpless children or for the education of a potential breadwinner in a trade. . . . Every cent contributed goes directly for such relief. . . . Here is charity in its purest form." No mention of birth control. Pure charity. Pure, and "scientific." Precise amounts are asked for—$434, $1,053, $247—all carefully budgeted to a total of $68,993. Do these budgets include the cost of examination, prescription and supplies for one year, which a birth-control clinic operating on a fairly large scale can provide for about $10

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York charitable organization recognizes officially that the giving of contraceptive information has anything to do with its job. Unofficially, of course, many social workers, on their own responsibility, refer cases needing contraceptive information to the very few New York centers now operating independently—the hospital clinics serve only their own patients.

But apply this 37 percent shown in The Times' sample hundred to the 530,000 New York families (some estimates run as high as 750,000), which, according to the Welfare Council Coördinating Committee, are affected by long unemployment to the point of requiring public or private relief. Thirty-seven percent of 530,000 families is 196,100. The maximum capacity of the clinics now operating is about 1,200 per month. Permanent rehabilitation? Scientific social work? Both child and adult dependency was increasing both in New York and in the country as a whole, even before the depression. Take The Times' "Record of Steady Growth." In 1912, $3,630.88 was received from The Times' first appeal and fourteen cases were relieved. In 1931, $295,660 was received and 446 cases relieved. It is estimated that American taxpayers, even in "prosperous" times, pay close to two billion dollars a year for dependency. One may as well cite again the familiar statistics showing both the fact and the cause. According to Professor Irving Fisher, in 1926, a prosperous year, 65 percent of our population (76,000,000) received 38.8 percent of the national income, or less than $460 per capita. Practically all this lowest-income group of utterly insecure people are permanently on the dole, at least in so far as medical care is concerned. Michael M. Davis, in "Paying Your Sickness Bills," estimates that the minimum cost of childbirth is $50. He also estimates that only about 2 percent of the people in the country can pay for all sickness expenses that they are likely to incur.

So much for the condition. Let us return briefly to that mythical press release. Obviously, no such action by the President's Organization for Unemployment Relief is possible, or even perhaps, from a strategic point of view, desirable. The President's Organization is indirectly a political body and political action is contra-indicated. Yet there seems no reason why the essence of the program suggested could not be and should not be achieved. Public opinion today accepts birth control and in the middle and upper classes it is very generally practised. Existing laws are admittedly absurd and obstructive, especially the federal statute forbidding the transportation by mail or express of contraceptive devices and information. But the loophole in the state laws which explicitly or tacitly exempts the relations of physician and patient is wide; so wide that existing clinics now practise undisturbed; so not in contraception. Twelve schools did not an-

chief terrors of the depression, namely that of unwanted and disastrous childbirth.

Any organized attempt by the medical profession and by social workers to make this possible would doubtless meet opposition; but, especially if the issue were kept out of politics, it would seem probable that the present desperate mood of public opinion would swamp such opposition as appeared. This probability, coupled with the loophole in existing law, constitutes the essence of a magnificent opportunity. In its immediate aspect such a program would be obviously humane, economical and "scientific"—or at least sensible. From the broader social point of view it is perhaps not too much to say that if this opportunity is not seized and seized promptly, the dysgenic effects appearing in the generation born during this depression may well prove to be serious. Grace Abbott has testified to the President's Organization that "children suffer the most serious permanent losses in periods of depression." It is scarcely necessary to add that no mentally responsible mother or father wants to add more children to a family which is already dependent upon charity.

It is up to the medical profession and to the privately financed social workers. Where do they stand?

First, as for the present status of the birth-control movement: It has been expanding for the past year at the rate of two clinics a month. California has twenty-five; New York twenty-two, counting hospital clinics serving only patients referred by their own departments; Illinois eight; Pennsylvania five; Georgia four; Ohio three; Michigan three; New Jersey two; Virginia two; Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Texas, West Virginia, Minnesota and Missouri each has one. Twenty-seven states have none at all. No state and no community in the nation has adequate service and there is no correlation whatever between existing need and existing facilities. Into the national headquarters of the three birth-control organizations in New York City there comes an average of 10,000 letters a year from mothers asking for birth-control information. Two-thirds of these letters cannot be answered satisfactorily; there are no clinics to serve these people and not even private physicians known to be equipped and willing to give contraceptive instruction.

As for the medical profession, the situation is sufficiently indicated by the results of the inquiry conducted by Dr. S. Adolphus Knopf in 1930. He wrote seventy-nine medical schools of the first rank, asking what instruction in birth control was being given to their students. Fourteen reported special courses: twenty-eight, incidental instruction which was considered inadequate; twenty, no instruction whatever; one, instruction in contraception but not in sterilization; four, instruction in sterilization but not in contraception. Twelve schools did not an-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Abdominal Surgery of the American Medical Association officially urged "the alteration of existing laws so that physicians may legally give contraceptive information to their patients in the regular course of practice." In April, 1930, the Public Health Relations Committee of the New York Academy of Medicine passed resolutions favoring the continuance of contraceptive clinics already established in hospitals, as well as the extension of such service, and the inclusion of courses of instruction in contraception in medical schools. These resolutions were made public a year later. One of them urged specifically the need of the special birth-control clinic, under competent physicians specially trained in gynecology. These are favorable portents: yet it is probably fair to say that today the majority of the medical profession is neither technically equipped nor intellectually prepared to undertake aggressive action in this field.

They are afraid of the law, as evidenced, for example, by the resolution above quoted, passed by a section of the American Medical Association. But the law is not stopping them in twenty-one states: nor does it stop the intelligent and courageous physician in forty-four states. Mr. George Packard, an eminent member of the Chicago bar, is only confirming what the birth-control clinics have already demonstrated when he says, "the real cause of contraception, confined as it should be to medical supervision, is not seriously hampered by the laws in their present state."

If, then, it be asked, "What's holding up the birth-control movement?" the answer is, not the law. What we have, apparently, is merely the tragic inertia of the two professions which have in their power, if they choose, to bring us out of this depression with at least one huge social and eugenic gain: the establishment of birth control as a *fait accompli* in this country, not outside the law, but within the law. These professions are the physicians and the social workers. It would cost $20,000,000 to give 2,000,000 unemployed families contraceptive information and equipment in 1932. It could be done, easily, as a common-sense relief measure, supported by a tide of public opinion even more powerful than that which overwhelmed the Eighteenth Amendment. If it is done, we shall be entitled to consider ourselves almost as civilized as, say, Holland, about fifty years ago. Would it be worth while? JAMES RORTY.

Big Navy Boys

III: *Who Is Behind the Navy League?*

SINCE it is evident from official investigations and sworn testimony by those competent to speak that selfish, as well as patriotic, interests are behind propaganda against naval limitations and in favor of immense increases in naval expenditures, the position of the Navy League of the United States becomes exceedingly delicate. Ostensibly it is concerned solely with national defense. Theoretically it is impartial as among conflicting interests. Is it so in fact? Is it entirely divorced from all parties and enterprises that profit from naval expenditures? On what presuppositions respecting foreign policy does it operate? Is it adequately equipped with a research staff competent to answer the technological questions involved in national defense?

The problem here raised with respect to the delicacy of the position occupied by the Navy League is not academic; it is real and must be faced. Any association of citizens formed for the purpose of influencing public policy is certainly within the rights prescribed by democracy, but whenever it advocates measures which redound to the benefit of particular interests, its structure and economic support must be open to public scrutiny. has a right to expound his beliefs, but if he expects to carry weight in public councils, he should, for reasons of expediency if nothing more, divorce himself from connections which may be deemed to connote, even remotely, motives of special interest. In a peculiar sense the Navy League is under obligations on this score. It declares that it espouses a cause that is sacred to the overwhelming majority of the American citizens—preparation for the protection of their heritage against foreign aggression—and yet it may endanger a good cause by affiliations that are open to attack on grounds of economic advantage.

This is not theoretical. Again and again the Navy League has been assailed in Congress and outside on account of its membership and support. For example, on December 15, 1915, it was severely criticized in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Clyde H. Tavenner, in a speech entitled "The Navy League Unmasked." Citing page 32 of The Navy League Journal, of February, 1904, Mr. Tavenner read the names of eighteen men and one corporation officially listed as "founders" of the League. The corporation was the Midvale Steel Company, from which, he declared, the United States government had bought,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual founders were Mr. Charles M. Schwab, of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation; Mr. J. P. Morgan, of the United States Steel Corporation, controlling the Carnegie Steel Company; Colonel R. M. Thompson, of the International Nickel Company, from all of which enormous purchases of navy materials had been made by the government.

Other founders included Mr. B. F. Tracy, Secretary of the Navy under President Harrison, who, after leaving office, became an attorney for the Carnegie Company and the Harvey Steel Company and was a director of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company; Mr. George Westinghouse, of wide affiliations with industrial concerns engaged in selling goods to the government; Mr. Clement A. Griscom, director of the United States Steel Corporation, the Cramp Ship and Engine Building Company, and the Electric Boat Company; and Mr. S. S. Palmer, a director of the Lackawanna Steel Company.

Having read the list and commented on it, Mr. Tavenner asked: "Is it not a rather peculiar coincidence that among those nineteen patriots who stepped forth from among all the millions of American citizens to save the country by advocating larger appropriations for battleships, every armor-making concern in the United States should be represented? And that the greater half of the nineteen patriots were connected with firms that would directly profit from such propaganda?"

Besides making these imputations, Mr. Tavenner objected to the friendly attitude of the American Navy League toward the similar organization in Germany, and quoted from issues of The Navy League Journal the following passages which appeared in the issues of July-December, 1903:

> Today, Germany, thanks to enlightened statesmanship and the support of the public, but most of all on account of the efforts of the Flotten-Verein, or Navy League, whose astounding results we shall strive to emulate in this country, may be looked upon as the fourth sea power in the world. . . . Without exaggeration it may be asserted that to the German Navy League, more than to any other influence besides, is due the fast and wholesome growth of the German navy.

After citing these passages from Navy League literature, Mr. Tavenner then asked why the Leagues of the various countries, instead of encouraging one another and "clasping hands around the world," did not join in suggesting a reduction in armaments. And he replied in his own way: "And the only answer the backers of the Navy League will make to us, if they make it truthfully, will be: 'It does not pay.'"

Not yet content with his treatment of the Navy League, Mr. Tavenner dug up from the archives of Congress the House of Representatives Report No. 1468, Fifty-third Congress, second session, entitled "Violations of Navy Plate Contracts," and quoted from testimony before the House Committee on Naval Affairs passages in which Mr. Schwab, then general superintendent of the Carnegie Company, conceded that he had given orders that "blowholes" in armor plate should not cause the rejection of the plate and that it was "likely" that the company "did really conceal the fact of blowholes in the plate." This citation Mr. Tavenner followed by a quotation from the official report in question: "The servants of the Carnegie Steel Company (whether with or without the knowledge of the company), to increase their gains, deliberately continued for many months to commit acts whose natural and probable consequence would be the sacrifice of the lives of our seamen in time of war, and, with them, perhaps, the dearest interests of the nation. . . . No fine or mere money compensation is an adequate atonement for such wrongs. The commission of such frauds is a moral crime of the gravest character." Mr. Tavenner added that President Cleveland assessed damages against the Carnegie Company which were immediately paid.

In turning over these pages of history it is not necessary to accept as true Mr. Tavenner's imputation of direct economic motives; nor is it proper, without further examination, to conclude that the charges of fraud drawn from a congressional-committee report are well founded. Assuming for the moment that his interpretation of the evidence is all wrong, the fact that he made the interpretation and broadcast the suspicion on the floor of the House of Representatives, the fact that such imputations are possible, is sufficient to impose upon the Navy League a double caution in raising its funds and carrying on its perfectly legitimate propaganda. Its present board of directors is composed of citizens whose respectability is beyond all question, but that does not absolve it from the necessity of displaying more than ordinary precaution in formulating its program and making its appeal for congressional support. Above all things it is imperative that the cause of national defense should not become involved in vitriolic controversies respecting propaganda, possible issues of private interest and historic rights and wrongs. It should be discussed on its merits by those who have separated themselves from all gains and profits involved in preparedness and war. Or, better still, all profits should be taken out of the business, so that its merits may stand clear in the noonday sun.

The truth is that it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the Navy League is at heart opposed to all limitations on naval armaments. It does now pay homage to "naval stability" and the terms of the London Treaty, but newspaper readers with memories will recall that in 1930 it vigorously urged the defeat of the Pact in the Senate. According to The Washington Herald of Monday, July

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement then awaiting ratification. To quote from the news report:

> A smashing attack on the London Naval Treaty was fired by the Navy League of the United States yesterday on the eve of the special session called by President Hoover to consider the Pact. Heretofore the League, reflecting the viewpoint of the high command of the American Navy, has withheld judgment on the treaty, merely urging that its consideration be postponed until next winter to allow the American people an opportunity to study it. The statement yesterday, however, issued by Walter Bruce Howe, chairman of the board, ripped into the treaty as jeopardizing American national security.

Defeated, however, in its effort to prevent the ratification of the Pact, the League then turned its attention to propaganda designed to induce the United States to build up to the limits set by the document.

In this connection it is not without significance that the British Navy League took a similar attitude toward the London Pact both before and after ratification. In a cable from London, dated October 20, 1930, it was stated in The New York Tribune:

> Strongly worded views concerning the present attempts to limit sea armaments are expressed in a statement sent to the newspapers of London tonight by the [British] Navy League on the eve of Trafalgar day. . . . "To Nelson," it says, "the pacifism that is fashionable today would have been as inconceivable as the pathetic trust in treaties unsupported by force. . . . It is the aim of the [British] Navy League, in days when the strength of the national navy has become a subject of political bargaining, to strive to keep alive the spirit which created and held our vast empire—the spirit that Nelson embodied. War is always hateful, but an empire dependent on the sea and unprepared to defend its vital arteries will sooner or later be dishonored and dismembered."

In other words, the British Navy League also proposes to demand a navy strong enough to perform a major operation in any waters of the world —and presumably to triumph over all possible foes, including, of necessity, the United States. At bottom it likewise places no reliance on any of the treaties and obligations assumed by the civilized nations of the earth.

Here, then, seems to be the paradoxical situation. If the creeds of navy leagues are to be adopted, then every great commercial power must be prepared to fight a victorious battle with any or all other powers in any waters of the earth. The logical outcome of this is an unshakable resolve on the part of each country to overtop its potential foes in naval units and equipment. A limitation on the principle of "parity" or ratios is, in this view, absurd, a surrender of national

On the other hand, positive limitations all around prescribing definite strength for each participant would suggest the disbandment of navy leagues as organs of propaganda. Indeed, this question arose at the time of the Washington Conference, when Colonel R. M. Thompson, then president of the American Navy League, was reported in The Washington Post of March 8, 1922, as saying that the result of the Washington Conference, as he saw it, was to put the League "out of commission." In addition, the news story runs, "he sees no further use for the League, and apparently is heartily glad of it." Evidently Colonel Thompson was a bit premature in his judgment, but he was undoubtedly right in seeing that naval limitation by international agreement had considerably restricted the function of further agitation.

That the government of the United States itself has doubts about the utility and helpfulness of Navy League programs and agitations was intimated during preparations for the London Conference, when it was reported, in The New York Evening Post of November 22, 1929, that the government had warned American societies, such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, that

> their alleged connection with the anti-disarmament agencies will be ruthlessly investigated by the Department of Justice should they attempt to interfere with proceedings in London. All "big navy" propaganda agencies in the United States are said to have been similarly warned. . . . To the shipbuilding interests which employed Shearer it has been intimated that President Hoover has legal power to withhold further contracts from private shipyards and that the President will not hesitate to exercise his power at the slightest sign of defeatist agitation. Finally, the United States navy itself has been reminded that the President is commander-in-chief and that his decision regarding future policy must override the opinions of admirals.

Whether this report was accurate or not, "big navy" propagandists were conspicuous by their moderation during the sessions of the London Conference. Indeed, there were differences of opinion within the Navy League itself, which were made evident in June, 1930, when Mrs. Harry E. Yarnell, wife of Rear Admiral Yarnell, resigned from the organization because she deemed its opposition to the treaty to be "unpatriotic."

Again in the autumn of 1931, when President Hoover announced his intention to force a reduction in naval expenditures, the Navy League leaped into the fray with a vitriolic attack upon the President's proposals and upon him personally. It referred to "the Wilson-like internationalism that characterizes President Hoover's expressions on peace and conciliation," found it difficult to express too much regret that the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent Hoover into exhibiting abysmal ignorance of why navies are maintained," and once more reiterated its fundamental policy, namely, that the navy of the United States must be strong enough to command the seas against any Power or combination of Powers. It also declared that if President Hoover's administration "accepts the proposal of the League of Nations [for a naval holiday], it does so knowing that its action specifically serves British and Japanese interests to the prejudice of analogous interests of the United States, although the responsibility of the President is primarily to and for the United States." It charged the President with subordinating American naval policy to the policies of foreign naval powers. In short, it accused him of starving the navy and deliberately and knowingly betraying his country by placing its interests below those of other nations.

These were grave charges for an ostensibly patriotic organization to bring against the President of the United States, and President Hoover felt bound to make an issue of the indictment. It is true that he ignored the insinuation against his intelligence and honor, but he appointed a committee of distinguished citizens, including an admiral and an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to inquire into the allegations of fact made by the Navy League. On November 6, 1931, this committee made a full report on specific points and came to the unanimous decision that the statement by the League's president "contains many inaccuracies, false assertions and erroneous conclusions and that his assumption as to the President's attitude toward the navy is wholly unwarranted." Meanwhile the board of directors of the Navy League, with only one dissenting voice, upheld the declarations, assertions and allegations made by its presiding officer.

The immediate result of the Navy League attack upon President Hoover was another flood of criticism denouncing it as the agent and spokesman of interested parties—manufacturers and merchants who make money out of selling naval supplies to the government. The Honorable Burton L. French, chairman of the Naval Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, issued a statement in which he said:

> Having in mind the sound policy of the President and the reasonable naval construction that is going forward, the issue right now becomes larger than the Navy League and resolves itself into whether or not the country shall have regard for actual naval needs and for the burdens of taxation that rest upon the people, as the President insists, or ignoring national welfare, turn the federal Treasury over to the exploitation of those who have personal ends to serve—navy yards and shipbuilders, aircraft and munition manufacturers—and to some extent officers who are [illegible]
>
> The statement of Mr. Gardiner seems to have been deliberate and malicious. It rests upon distorted tables and unsustained premises. The truth is available to Mr. Gardiner.

At the same time, the declaration by Mr. French was supplemented by a statement from Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas, in which he said:

> We have understood all the time that the Navy Department is in accord with the President's program; the attack of the Navy League was not justified in any degree.
>
> It should be understood and remembered that the Navy League includes in its membership those who sell steel, and others commercially interested in the profits from armament building. These have a selfish interest to override their loyalty to their country and their own regard for the truth. The fact is, we have had this same kind of a fight from the Navy League—false statements, misconstructions of government reports, half-truths hooked up with barefaced falsehoods—every time we have tried to hold down expenditures for the navy to a reasonable limit. It might be mentioned that the army budget was reduced $40,000,000 almost without question—there is no commercial organization, such as the Navy League, boosting for big army appropriations. The pity of it is that in the past the Navy League has imposed on the public, especially along the seaboard, as a patriotic organization. The country should be grateful to President Hoover for having torn off its mask and shown it to us as the greedy commercial organization that it is—seeking to make excessive profits from the government for steel and shipbuilding companies under the plea of super-patriotism.

The principal support for the Navy League's program came from the Honorable Fred A. Britten, whose manipulation of naval and real-estate interests had made him notorious throughout the country. Although Mr. Britten did not openly take the side of the Navy League, he announced that if the President did not introduce a navy building program, he would introduce a bill calling for the expenditure of $150,000,000 for naval craft, and would demand an investigation to determine whether Mr. Hoover's navy cuts were justified or imperiled national defense. Whether the Navy League relished indorsement by a gentleman already accused before the country of conduct unbecoming a member of Congress was not made known, but obviously approval from that quarter increased rather than diminished the delicacy of its position.

Clearly, then, a congressional investigation of naval affairs is due, and when the inquiry is made it will be in order to ask the official representative of the Navy League the following questions:

Is the Navy League a membership organization? Does it inquire of applicants for membership whether they are interested in a pecuniary way in naval expenditures by the government? Does the Navy League accept subscriptions other than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount received from each contributor? Does the League maintain a staff of specialists for research in naval affairs? Has the League favored the limitation of naval armaments by international agreement? Does the League believe that the solution of the problem of national defense can be separated from the determination of the foreign policies of the United States government? Does it believe that in the formation of foreign policies and the determination of naval construction the civil branches of the United States government are supreme over the naval and military branches? What is a naval expert? Can such an expert determine mathematically just what and how many fighting craft are to be constructed to win any war with any or all Powers? Do you know what navies are for? How did you find that out? You say that American naval policy is being subordinated to those of other Powers. How did you find that out? Do you regard it as proper for a propagandist body to go behind heads of departments and distribute progagandist literature on vital matters of public policy through subordinates of the administration?

Nobody is, of course, infallible, but it is clear that, given our technological circumstances, the determination of our naval program cannot be left to the Navy League, to the Navy Department or to naval officers alone. The best, the most competent, the most imaginative and the most disinterested intelligence of the country must be brought to bear upon it in the clear light of day, under full public scrutiny. Anything short of this does not meet the requirements of the situation which confronts the nation.

It is evident, therefore, that President Hoover has contributed powerfully to the clarification of the navy issue by asserting anew the supremacy of the civilian branch of the federal government, by defining in terms of policy the objects and objectives of national defense, by repudiating the gospel of *Welt- und Machtpolitik,* and by bringing the Navy League propagandists to bay. In such circumstances, enlightened leadership in Congress surely cannot fail to support him. To drift and flounder is fatal. Only limited objectives in this hemisphere are in keeping with national interests —are possible, in fact, unless forsooth the nation is really planning to challenge and "lick all creation" and thinks that "adequate" preparations can be made for that job. Obviously, then, international coöperation in the limitation of sea armaments—supplemented by the economic boycott—is the only alternative to a neck-breaking rivalry that may spell disaster to any or all Powers. And the business of directing the enterprise of adult education in this sphere belongs to disinterested citizens, not to navy leagues, navy bureaucrats, armament profiteers and facile journalists paid by concerns with dividends at stake.

Washington Notes

Democratic Tax Bill—The Finance Board—Dawes as Running Mate—Stick-to-it Charlie

NOW THAT the Reconstruction Finance Corporation proposal, key feature of the Hoover program, has passed Congress, interest here is concentrated upon the Democratic taxation program. By the time this piece appears, the bill probably will have emerged from the Ways and Means Committee. At present no one can with certainty forecast its character. All I can say is that if the counsels of the more important Democratic advisers prevail, the bill will increase rather than decrease the Hoover-Mills rates. Apparently the Democratic leaders have a clearly defined notion that the wisest political course is to be able to boast that the Democrats not only supported all of Hoover's recommendations for promoting business recovery, but that they restored the national Treasury to solvency—an act which Mr. Hoover knew was necessary but did not have the courage to advocate.

That this course will be good politics seems to me too plain to dispute. It will put the Democrats in a fairly sound position during the campaign, whether business recovers or not. If Hoover's reconstruction bills are enacted and the Democratic balancing of the budget is passed, the rest that happens during this session is of relatively minor importance. All the two parties will do thereafter will be to sit back and await results. The strategy of the Democrats is to put themselves in a position where, in the event of the depression's lifting measurably during the summer, they can nullify the effect of the Republican arguments of "Hoover pulled the country out" and "Don't Swap Horses Crossing the Stream." If the depression does not lift, then they need not bother. No Republican slogan, argument or appeal will be of the least avail.

As I have previously pointed out, the Republicans' main hope—or at least the hope of those close to Hoover—is lodged in the Reconstruction Finance Board. The general conviction is that in the admittedly strong hands to which its policies have been committed, it will completely restore the stability of both banks and railroads, and that this will put an end to fear and hoarding and start business on the upgrade. Perhaps it will, and perhaps this will reëlect Mr. Hoover, despite his present low political state. At any rate, such is the hope, and stranger things have happened —though not often.

Speaking of his prospects, it appears that Postmaster General Walter F. Brown, who all along has been the real political agent of the administration, is now out in the open as Hoover's manager. Chairman Fess's role as puppet is completely revealed, and the strong, experienced hand of Mr. Brown is evident in a number of recent moves. What he has done is to put the whole weight of federal patronage back of the movement to renominate Hoover—which means, of course, that he will be overwhelmingly renominated. The futility of opposing an incumbent President for renomination has been so completely demonstrated in the past that it is absurd not to recognize the fact. Though the progressive Republican group does recognize

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the renomination without a protest. They probably will not control any great number of votes in the convention, but they will have quite enough to record an emphatic disapproval. I also have some reason to believe that regardless of the presidential-primary elections and the complete control of the convention by the administration forces, the progressive group plans a popular demonstration preceding the convention designed to show not only Hoover's weakness in the party, but his weakness among the people. The intention is to sound a warning in order to make it more difficult for the administration to carry out its convention program.

All this, of course, will aid the Democrats and increase their chances of offsetting whatever advantage Hoover may gain from business recovery and improved conditions, if and when they arrive. Even the Democrats admitted that the selection of General Charles G. Dawes as president of the Reconstruction Board was a good political stroke. Not because it removes Dawes as a possible contender for the presidential nomination, for he already had removed himself in the vigorous statement he made in Chicago; but because it popularizes the Reconstruction Board idea and to a large extent forestalls the charge that it is primarily to benefit the big banking interests.

To be sure, Dawes is a banker himself, but he is much more than that. He is a colorful personality with real popularity and a talent for public salesmanship hardly equaled by any other public man in the country. It is generally recognized that, so far as the executive end of the Board is concerned, the dominant figure will be that of the chairman, Mr. Eugene Meyer, but General Dawes will be the man in the public eye. So far as the public is concerned, the Board will be a Dawes Board; so far as the bankers are concerned, it will be a Meyer Board. The two men really should make an effective combination, and function without friction. I am told the arrangement suits them both and there is complete understanding and accord between them, which is certainly a pleasant thought to those of us who are more anxious to have the Board perform for the benefit of the country than for the benefit of either party or any individual in either party.

Before leaving the subject of General Dawes, I cannot help mentioning the curious way in which the Washington correspondents manage to manufacture political potentialities out of everything he does, and everything that happens to him. They do this, of course, with others as well, and the presidential booms in their dispatches are sometimes based on the flimsiest of foundations. Mr. Dawes, however, seems to lend himself to this sort of thing more than anyone else. No sooner had he squelched the rumor that he was out for the presidential nomination then talk about him as a running mate with Mr. Hoover began.

The difficulty of reconciling these two suggestions in no way diminishes their circulation. At the moment Washington is dripping with the notion that the administration will be so grateful for General Dawes' work in the reconstruction field that it will put pressure on him to accept the vice-presidential nomination. There is at this time nothing whatever in the talk. No person of any public weight, I am convinced, has considered this contingence. He can by way of [illegible] Nevertheless, it might easily work out that way, for beyond question Dawes would add great strength to the Hoover ticket. He is as strong as Mr. Curtis is weak. Of course, the substitution of Dawes for Curtis would be a difficult thing to do without treating the Kansas statesman with what would seem to be calculating brutality. Probably it will not be done, but it is certainly true that there is no politician close to Mr. Hoover who would not rejoice if a way could be found to drop Charlie without an unfavorable reaction.

It looks as if there is no way out now for those who feel that if ever a presidential candidate needed a strong running mate, Herbert Hoover is that candidate. None the less, as the convention draws near, it is to be expected that we shall hear more about drafting Dawes for the vice-presidency. It is a nice sort of subject on which to base speculative Washington dispatches, and there will be a good many of these up to the moment that General Dawes squelches his vice-presidential boom in the same way he squelched his presidential boom. But even that won't stop it completely. Under our system, conventions do not draft presidential candidates, but they do occasionally draft vice-presidential ones. A recognition of this fact will keep the question of Hoover's running mate from being completely put under the head of finished business until after the convention has acted. But all that is still a long way off. The matter of immediate concern is the Democratic tax bill. On that we soon shall see sparks fly high in Congress, and I think that the squealing of groups and individuals caught in the squeeze as the rates go up will be unparalleled and pathetic.

Washington. T. R. B.

Two Events

Vicente Escudero and His Ensemble. Chanin Theatre, January 17, 1932.

Distant Drums, by Dan Totheroh. Belasco Theatre, January 18, 1932.

IT IS NOT easy in Spain itself to get a full or even a fair knowledge of all the dances belonging to provinces and towns, or for that matter of the chief dances to be found in almost any part of Spain where dancing lives at all. We know more or less vaguely of the *Jota Aragonese*, for instance, the man and the woman advancing toward each other in a kind of mock aggression, the swift animation throughout that strange and primitive monotony, the quality of harshness and strong clean force, lusty without voluptuous insinuation. We have some acquaintance with the dances that are Andalusian, and know that they have in them more room for grace and seduction, an intensity subduing the music to a simple line and the dancer to a grave and subtle progression toward the most passionate outcome. Señor Escudero's program includes such dances as the *Jota Huesca*, for example, the *Zapateado*, the *Fandango*, the *Seguidilla* or the *Farruca;* and the spectator here in an American theatre, far from the scene where the dances belong, seeing them behind footlights and not participating in their event with shouts and cries and an excitement rising with the dancer's, must get what

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Escudero's, Señorita Carmita and Señorita Carmela from time to time assist, plus solos of their own. They are not to be despised, especially Carmita. She has many lovely and glowing qualities, however impossible it may be to remember her presence when Escudero is on the stage with her and despite the fact that he is best when he dances alone, without her company. Be all this special matter as it may.

But what evolves at once, to anyone with senses and with an ear and, more happily, too, with an instinct for line in drawing, is the magnificent economy and precision. It appears the moment Escudero walks on to the stage, a movement proud and clean. You have the sense of something basic in this art; you have the sense of something that is a foundation from which much has sprung and to which, through genius and long labor, this artist can at will return. You see that the dancer can at will be embodied rhythm, as waves of sound can be, not the mere instrument by which rhythm is produced. You keep returning to the idea of the basic; you see how the purity in the traditional mass of a dance, accumulated through generations of men, has been discovered, as a fine draughtsman out of a full body of matter finds the pure and basic line. What impressed me most, however, I think, or kept turning over as an absorbing subject at the back of my mind, was the way in which under what might seem a monotony of form he created such inexhaustible variation—I do not mean in the entire program but even in a single dance. This is one quality in art in which I can with certainty take refuge, where, within a limited pattern and suspense, the shadings and variations establish a deep and whole statement, not something that, however complex and aspirational it may be, is eventually but half said for lack of outline, and is given to wandering off into the void.

Escudero was less good in the pantomimic dance, the only one of the sort on his program, and this only stresses the fact of that hard, outward character of what he does supremely, an art that is free in its flowing invention but final in type, and almost impersonal, like a work of nature's. Within the healthy, clear form the intensity is unbroken, the virility and the proud regulation of the emotional content is almost austere.

How wide a swing is it from this Spanish art to that of Miss Pauline Lord, whose playing of the central character in "Distant Drums" is the chief credit of the occasion. Here is an art which could derive from no tradition and on which no tradition could be built. It is form so entirely related to the particular artist's own meaning and interpretation that, divorced from her, it would only be a mannerism or decadence in straight style. It has an immediacy that prevents its even remaining in the memory as technical moments or outlines; a trick of the voice, of pause, a gesture now and then, we recall; the rest has moved so far inward that it is largely our own response that stings and moves us still. Of her art you know that its small voice haunts your ears and its weakness overpowers you, as you go back to it in your thoughts, thoughts tender and somewhat awed by that of which you seem to have heard only the echo. As a question of originality, all this is neither to Miss Lord's, as compared with Escudero, original artist than she, since he has achieved a style so pure and basic that it is a lesson to artists in every field. If Miss Lord is a comment on the soul of art, Escudero is a comment on its essential nature.

I thought that Miss Lord, returned after some years of absence from the stage, read more deeply and unerringly than I have ever heard her, and the variations in pitch and tone in the use of her voice showed a step forward—in the scene of the Lord's Prayer, for instance, where her relation to the rest of the voices speaking the lines, her own cry interwoven with the steady movement of the other speakers, could not have been imagined till you heard it. Her whole conception of the elusive role was without a false note, and from the start was tangible and human, for all its fluttering, profound, beautiful values and meanings.

Mr. Totheroh's play tells the story of a company of pioneers from the Midde West on their way to Oregon, in the year 1848. They are of many sorts, a schoolmaster, a preacher, a doctor and merchants, families, what not. The captain of the expedition, Wolfhill, has married a wife so that his land claim may be doubled, but has fallen in love with her and is tortured by her distance from him. Jason, a young man, his assistant, is also in love with Eunice Wolfhill. The Indians have been following close on their trail. Their drums are often to be heard. The chief has parleyed with the guide of the party, but what he proposed the guide has kept secret. Eunice feels the sense of something awaiting her, the thought of the Indians haunts her, she has talked with them, she slips away to watch their dance from some nearby ambush. Misled by the advice of the Indians the travelers take a short cut and are lost in the mountains, as winter comes on. Deaths, births and the familiar run of human life are present in the camp. In the end Jason steals provisions by way of making escape possible for him and Eunice. She will not go with him, though perhaps she loves him. Her husband discovers Jason's devotion. The guide returns from a forlorn attempt to find the pass; he can only reveal at last the Indians' long standing offer: they will help if the captain's wife be given to the chief for his squaw. This is the mystical fate that has been holding her back and at the same time carrying Eunice on; her family have always been strange; all her life she has felt something awaiting her. She goes out to give herself up to the chief, and the travelers are saved.

Some years ago Mr. Totheroh was the author of a play, "Wild Birds," that showed a poetic hand and a gift for pathetic character and incident far beyond the common. The underlying idea of this new play is full of the same quality, and the conception of the main character something very fine and beautiful in the theatre. The impression of the play on the stage at the Belasco was one of slowness too often, a sort of lagging suspense; for suspense, of some impending, almost unearthly thing, was in the air. This fault was partly due to the rate at which the actors took their lines in all those scenes where many people were on the stage. The first section, in fact, before Miss Lord's entrance, gave the play a low pulse at its very send-off. There were elaborate but not very convincing efforts toward realistic exactness in the many characters and a slow-spoken, rugged deliberatedness and simplicity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The drag of the scenes was due also to the lack of edge and life in the diction and images of the dialogue. There was some degree of dialect, or attempt at old and frontier usages in grammar and pronunciation, but any close listening to the lines would have seen that the meat of hearty, innate English speech was not in them. Good salty phrase and a closer drawing in the character indications as implied in the dialogue would have done wonders for the entire play.

The whole company in "Distant Drums," if not inspired in any sense or so convincing as ten years of such a training as the Moscow Art Theatre's might have made them, showed, nevertheless, an admirable spirit of working together. There was a general impression of sincerity and of respect for the meaning of the play. Mr. Arthur Hohl as Wolfhill the captain, Eunice's husband, Mr. Edward Pawley as the lover and schemer, and Mr. Edward Ellis as the guide, did fair enough work. Miss Beulah Bondi as the old mother, a character seen only for a short time on the stage before death from exhaustion and old age took her, might have served as a model for all the pioneer problems of the other actors. In her brief moments Miss Bondi created enough prophetic atmophere to last the play a long time. The single setting by Mr. Jo Mielziner was a highly competent, if not highly imaginative, realistic design of covered wagons rounded up into a camp.

It is only proper, with this new production of theirs, to make acknowledgments to Mr. Guthrie McClintic as director and Miss Katherine Cornell as lessee at the Belasco. In both this, their second, and in their first production for their new venture, they have tried for pieces worth doing and well above the dead level of stage commodities. "Brief Moment" contributed to our playwriting a needed direction by its adult interest in states of mind and emotional qualifications. As for "Distant Drums," it should be clear to anyone, thinking over the list of pioneering and long-trail, covered-wagon dramas seen in the past, that this play is another matter. It shows us more of what is sensitive and true in the people making up such a company, in such a situation; and makes the situation itself serve only to express and heighten the elements of human life that are universally found. What works in this play is not mere buckskin prowess, suspense and prairie romance, but the press of life.

STARK YOUNG.

Wheat in Winter

The green moss and the myrtle plant
Flourish not forever;
And man, who is the only one
Who knows how swift the race is run,
Equally must wither—
Though the air within his lung,
Small spring rain, and seed, and sun
Sustain no lack whatever.

Wherefore, soldier, kiss your sweet
And sow yourself for winter wheat
That the ear may be complete
Before it fail forever.

MARTHA KELLER.

The Superrealists

THE SUPERREALIST painters, shown at the Julien Levy Gallery in New York City during the month of January, present modern art in one of the stages of its retreat from Cézannism and cubism. They have certain new shudders, though, on the whole, they will not convulse an art-loving public which has been toughening itself recently in the Museum of Modern Art and the emancipated galleries of West Fifty-seventh Street.

The most logical of the modern painters, following the adventure of cubism were faced with the prospect of becoming silent thereafter. But fortunately for us, and after an inward struggle, Picasso, Matisse, Chirico, Paul Klee, Rivera and their followers resumed painting in a great variety of styles, neo-classical, fantastic, baroque, socialist and superrealist. For the last development, toward superrealism, we had been somewhat prepared by recent showings of Picasso—in the next to the last manner—Miro, Masson, and most notably Pierre Roy, at the Brummer Galleries in 1931.

Looking at this new collection of superrealist paintings, photographs and objets d'art, one suspects that the movement is destined to great fortune in America. It has a particularly infectious propaganda, and has already affected several young American painters, three of whom are among the group now exhibited. (One foresees superrealist furniture, newsreel theaters, skyscrapers, supplanting "Modernart" which has given us so little for our money.) These paintings are unblushingly "literary," rather than abstract or purist; their ideas derive from the Marquis de Sade, Rimbaud, Lewis Carroll, Freud and Charlie Chaplin, all of whom may be found, upon close scrutiny, to have much in common with one another. There is a whole philosophy, an imposing dialectical ambience, surrounding superrealism, in the light of which we may measure its productions.

"It is not we who see crookedly, disarrange, torment or obscure Nature," the leading apologists of superrealism say in effect. "It is you, you bourgeois, with your Civilization and Progress, who have proscribed all search for a Truth that does not conform to convention. . . . We believe in the future resolution of the two states, dream and reality, so contradictory in appearance, into a sort of absolute reality, Superreality. . . . We believe in the Incarnation of the Dream, in the realization of Desire Solidified." Other spokesmen, showing the hand, or the cloven hoof, more candidly, declare for the "Permanent Revolution," describe themselves as agents of a "moral activity dictated by the paranoiac will to augment and systematize the processes of confusion." Slogans, pictures and their titles all meet and mingle at the Julien Levy Gallery.

The paintings of Max Ernst dominate the exhibition, not so much by their beauty as by their dialectic. Ernst is the negation of painting; he scorns the painter's brush technique. He is at heart a great magician out of the variety theatre: now he transforms an old-fashioned wallpaper into some actual vision, or now he clips and pastes together ingenious bits from the French equivalent of a Sears-Roebuck catalogue. The principle of making the most arbitrary, the wittiest possible rearrangement of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all of the other superrealists. It may be enjoyed with the least discomfort in the mellow painting of Pierre Roy, "Musique No. 3"; and the same drive toward the dream world is felt, as a most brilliant and disconcerting effect, in the work of Salvador Dali, who has confessed himself a "paranoiac painter." Dali's "Persistance de la Mémoire" is a dream picture that will haunt the minds of all those who look upon it: against a lugubrious blue sky, three huge, fetishlike watches, of baroque ornamentation, turn into dough and go dripping over the stump of a blasted tree, over the edge of a cliff, and over the body of a dead horse in the foreground. But it must not be assumed that the superrealists are sad. For the most part they make merry with various combinations of new materials and substances and with all the "solidified desires" in the subconscious caverns of their minds.

One welcomes all such fantasy and fun-making, even though it seems to lead back to the baroque. One welcomes it as a stimulus because our own culture in America has long tended to be both sober and utilitarian. Our popular folk-spirit, however, is something else. Certainly it is far from academic.

Of the American works included in this show, the most impressive thing of all is the front page of The Evening Graphic for January 28, 1927. Here is the synthetic photograph of the "Honeymoon Horror" of Peaches and Daddy Browning, and their famous bedroom scene. Peaches lies weeping on the floor, with Browning, the "big gander man" offering her a large baby-doll, while the African goose in the right background screams: "Honk, honk, it's the bonk!" Perfect superrealism. The lesson of The Evening Graphic is that we have long been producing superrealist art in the raw state. The European artists of the French capital have inspired themselves with our movies, our jazz comedians, our folk customs, have refined all this material and sent it back to us. Nevertheless, we recognize the home product with mingled approbation, amusement and embarrassment.

MATTHEW JOSEPHSON.

The Praying Mantis

"THAT MUST be one of them bugs the gov'ment brings in to eat germs," says the cabby.

The owner of the dog, which is still fighting the mantis, nods in agreement. A waiter comes out of this cheap lunch room in a Virginia city. He is joined by the cook, fanning himself with a racing sheet.

The mantis is no match for the dog. Neck long, front legs drawn up, the insect makes one think of a green horse caught in the middle of a leap over fence or hedge.

"There's that infant's paralysees comes from germs. That bug must be one of them bugs the gov'ment's got to eat germs."

The four men squat around the mantis. It fences with its legs and spreads its wings. Soaked in the dog's saliva, it looks like a racer collapsed in the middle of the track.

The men sit on boxes in the night and talk.

"You should'a kept the dog away. This bug's out to do good," says the cabby.

"You're the feller's always hammering the gov'ment. How come you give it credit for the bug?" says the waiter.

"When they do good in Washington, I gives them credit."

"Yessir, you're the feller's always ripping Hoover's pants off," says the cook.

"You boys got me wrong. It's them poleeticians got him by the nose. That Hoover's a smart feller. He's an ingineer."

"He don't do nothing about this deepression," says the owner of the dog.

"Even Jesus come on earth holy couldn't," says the waiter. "It's one of them things got to come. Like getting old and dying."

"I know what it's all about. I used to make fifty a week running round with the old boiler. I'm glad to make twenty now, working fourteen hours a day. I got a wife and five kids. There's nothing in the taxi game now."

"Business is hit everywhere. They're eating cats and dogs in China," says the waiter.

The cook just glowers and keeps fanning. His sweaty arms are tattooed with girls straight as daggers, a fist around each middle.

"What gets me is how it all come about," says the cabby.

The owner of the dog pulls it away from the scrapping mantis. "If they cut out all the bankers, the country'd feel its oats."

"That's so," says the waiter.

"It could be a hundred times worse," says the man with the dog. "Anyway, after next presidential elections, us Democrats'll win. It'll be full pails again. Black on white, it'll be full pails again."

The cabby shakes his head. "They say we could have prosperity back again if the airplane business was a-humming. When airplanes are thick as cars, they'll need factories to build them. They'll take more gas. Everything'll pick up snappy."

The waiter says, "All I know is wages is shooting down the chute now."

The cook gets up. "We got cut twice. Soon we'll have to pay the boss for working." He sees the quivering mantis. He steps savagely on it. He sits down, looking relieved.

"Hey, what's the idear?" cries the cabby.

"It's better off dead," snickers the cook.

The cabby squats over it. "Yessir, it's dead. Well, the gov'ment's rich enough to get more where they comes from."

"Good thing about your being dead," says the waiter. "You don't have to get up at five o'clock in the flophouse to run to this slophouse. Slophouse, flophouse. . . ."

"You ain't got a stinking taxi stuck in your head all day."

"You're a long time dead without your having once to turn over on your belly."

"You don't have to hang over goddam fires till your eyes are licked out. It makes you forget better than a bottle or a woman. You don't wake up to root like hell in your pockets. There's nothing like being dead, me boys, nothing. . . ."

The boys nod thoughtfully in the dark, their hands dangling between their legs. The dog sniffs at the mantis, crushed to green slime.

DIGITIZED BY ARCHIVE OF ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Crisp County Carries On

SIR: Some weeks ago Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock in one of his articles in The Wall Street Journal reminded the writer and The New Republic of an article printed in The New Republic about a year ago describing the establishment of the publicly owned electric plant of Crisp County, Georgia, and in a pleasingly taunting fashion begged to be informed "in detail how this pioneer is doing."

What was in Mr. Woodlock's mind developed when The Atlanta Constitution, The New York Times and other papers through the country printed a story on December 18 which carried the implication that this publicly owned plant had failed and the commissioners in charge were asking the Georgia Power Company to buy the plant and save the county from disaster.

I have received so many inquiries which show a widespread interest in this pioneer county plant that it seems desirable to me to assure the readers of The New Republic that the yarn is interesting if true, but that it does not happen to be true. The following excerpt from a public statement by the president of the Crisp County Chamber of Commerce will correct the erroneous reports that have been so widely circulated:

> The Crisp County power plant has never been offered to the Georgia Power Company and such a possibility is not even contemplated by the citizens of Crisp County.

Washington, D. C. JUDSON KING.

For a 50-Percent Cut

SIR: I wish to call your attention to the enclosed letter which the Emergency Peace Committee has sent to the President today in connection with the forthcoming Disarmament Conference.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE,
Chairman, Emergency Peace Committee,
Fellowship of Reconciliation.

[ENCLOSURE]

The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.
Dear Mr. President:

The members of the Emergency Peace Committee are deeply concerned that the American delegation to the World Disarmament Conference at Geneva should be instructed to take a vigorous initiative in proposing to the Disarmament Conference from the very start that a sweeping reduction in armaments be made, and that the United States considers this a matter of the utmost importance and will put the full strength of her efforts into the accomplishment of a drastic disarmament program.

In the light of your statement to the International Chamber of Commerce that "the world expenditure on all arms is now nearly five billions of dollars yearly, an increase of 70 percent over that previous to the Great War," it is evident that a reduction of present armament expenditures by even 25 percent would still leave the nations more heavily burdened and more dangerously weaponed than they were in 1914.

We therefore urge that you instruct the American delegates to the Geneva Conference to propose a reduction of 50 percent in the armaments of the world, to take effect in 1933, as a basis for early future efforts toward complete and universal disarmament.

The Draft Convention for the Disarmament Conference proposes abstinence from chemical warfare but does not prohibit preparation for such war. We believe that there is no way of regulating the employment of poison gas and bacteria in time of war and no way of protecting the population against the hideous consequences of this method of warfare. We therefore ask that

LICENSED TO GREZO
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disarmament Conference the immediate discontinuance of enlistment and conscription of every branch of the military service in all countries.

> JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, chairman, Emergency Peace Committee; DEVERE ALLEN, chairman, Pacifist Action Committee; DOROTHY DETZER, executive secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; JOHN DEWEY, president, The People's Lobby; ALVIN C. GODDARD, executive secretary, World Peace Commission of Methodist Episcopal Church; WILLIAM I. HULL; JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, chairman, War Resisters' League; J. B. MATTHEWS, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation; CLARENCE PICKETT, executive secretary, American Friends' Service Committee; TUCKER P. SMITH; NORMAN THOMAS, director, League for Industrial Democracy; HOWARD Y. WILLIAMS, executive secretary, League for Independent Political Action.

New York City.

Miners' Defense Conference

SIR: Harlan, Kentucky, is very much in public print just now. The Governor's commission has found "a state of lawlessness" to exist there, primarily perpetrated by officials sworn to uphold the law, acting in conjunction with coal-company thugs, imported to destroy unionism. Forty-nine miners, defending their lives and dependents, are indicted for "conspiracy to murder" as a result of this condition of affairs. . . .

Fifty-nine New York City labor and fraternal organizations have banded together to form the Kentucky Miners' Defense and Relief Conference. They have arranged a mass meeting to enlist public aid to be held at Irving Plaza, Fifteenth Street and Irving Place, on Friday evening, January 29. The list of speakers includes Joseph Cawood, miner and town clerk of Evarts, Kentucky, one of the indicted men, Roger Baldwin, Judge Jacob Panken, Louis Budenz, Arturo Giovanniti, Benjamin Fletcher, F. C. Bearce and others. Lovers of fairness and decency are urged to attend. The conference's address is 90 East Tenth Street, New York City. Further information will be gladly given.

JUSTUS EBERT,
New York City. Delegate to the Conference.

New York's Destitute

SIR: According to the Welfare Council of New York City, 800,000 of the 3,187,636 persons ordinarily engaged in gainful occupations are now unemployed. In other words, a quarter of the working population has no work.

The public is being exhorted not to give alms on the street. We are told that the demand for free beds and meals has not overtaken the supply. Fortunately, all of the destitute unemployed have not yet become vagrants. There are still thousands of families trying to hold together as families. I doubt whether many who "have shared" realize how little their generosity amounts to in the face of existing need.

Up to six weeks ago the Emergency Work Bureau of the Gibson Committee had received over 112,000 applications, of which about 95,000 were rated as deserving. Thirty thousand of these were assigned jobs and 26,000 others were rated as *urgent cases*. The Gibson Committee closed registrations six weeks ago. What is happening to the 26,000 (and their families) whose need is attested and who were led to hope in vain?

The City Emergency Work Commission has taken over 13,000 placements made by the Gibson Committee. The standards of the Gibson Committee were [illegible]

job; thus, if a son has living with him an aged mother who draws a monthly old-age pension of $20, it is supposed to suffice them both and he is dropped from the pay roll. A man with four or more dependents is dropped should there be a family income of $40 per month from other sources; a man with a wife and eight dependent children is disqualified if one of them earns $12 a week.

These are only a few of the facts. Those who have taken upon themselves the responsibility of caring for the unemployed and their dependents cannot be blamed for the inadequacy of the means at their disposal. But unless they make known publicly the facts of relief, they are party to a cruel hoax. The nature and conditions of relief must be published so that thousands of "ineligibles" who are now hoping in vain will cease to do so. The ratio between estimated needs and available resources must be shown so that the public may see the inadequacy of relief provision and become aroused. The desperate situation of thousands calls for loud and outspoken frankness on this subject. Anything else is social sabotage.

New York City. JOHN ROTHSCHILD.

Material on Aaron Burr

SIR: I am working on a biography of Aaron Burr and am asking assistance from those who have any material dealing with him: letters, stories, impressions, suggestions, advice. I shall appreciate any assistance that readers of The New Republic may be able to give me, and every manuscript, letter or document loaned will receive particular care and be promptly returned to the owner. I may be addressed at 17 Crestwood Avenue, Crestwood, New York.

Crestwood, N. Y. C. EDGAR BROWN.

Hillman and the Amalgamated

SIR: While I am not known to the liberal press as an authority on labor questions, I am a worker who has long been active in the labor movement. I want to reply to Mr. Hardman's recent articles, which I feel have seriously misrepresented the situation in the Amalgamated.

One of Mr. Hardman's footnotes says that to avoid the charge of bias (since he has an important place in the Amalgamated) he has stuck to facts which are well established. Let us see how well established Hardman's facts are, and whether or not he is biased.

First, Hardman did not describe present conditions as they exist. He is an experienced statistician and knows figures. Why didn't he cite them?

Second, Hardman did not tell us there has been a change in working conditions under Hillman's regime since 1919. But there have been changes in conditions from bad to worse each season and there is no end to it.

Third, the Hillman machine has used precisely the same policy against the rank and file as that used by John L. Lewis in the miners' union, which Mr. Hardman thinks so wrong.

The Amalgamated was a fighting organization until 1921. Its last battle with the employers took place in the same year and lasted for twenty-six weeks. After this bitter struggle Hillman became a statesman, a chief, not a fighter for the cause and interests of the workers. He forced on the tailors "standards of production" (which he called efficiency) and reduction in wages (which he called "adjustments"), to say nothing of reduction in working forces whereby workers were and still are thrown out of the shops each season.

Something had to be done to put a stop to this unbearable situation. So the local unions, under the control of the progressives or Lefts, demanded these changes in the New York organizations: (1) a minimum wage scale; (2) an aggressive and constructive policy against "standards of production," reductions in wages and reduction in working forces every few weeks. The militants let Hillman know that they were determined to put up a fight for these reforms. What did Hillman do? He saw that the progressives meant business, so he decided to take in Beckerman, a person he had always disliked, and without an election made him remember how Beckerman with his gang broke up meetings, blackjacked members, deprived workers of their jobs or threw them out of their shops? Not only were individual members expelled and ruthlessly blacklisted, but local unions, such as Local 5 of New York and the pressers' local of Rochester, were suspended and reorganized. The protesting elements were thus thoroughly crushed.

When the Hillman machine defeated the rebels they promised to set the house in order and improve working conditions for the tailors in New York. Have they improved conditions since? Let us see.

They introduced and forced the piece-work system on the workers, although the workers rejected it at meetings. The liberal and Socialist press hailed this move as a victory for the workers. What the employers could not get when they fought the Amalgamated for twenty-six weeks in 1921, they thus got through Hillman's good-will policy and constructive leadership. . . . With the introduction of the piece-work system, Hillmanism brought back the sweat shop of the old days. Union conditions are a thing of the past. The prices are so low that the workers, in order to make $30 a week, must work fifty to sixty hours, while many workers remain unemployed for two years or more. Aren't these facts, Brother Hardman, well established? . . .

Thus we see that under Hillman's leadership the once powerful and militant Amalgamated was destroyed and became a racket like Lewis' United Mine Workers of America.

Hardman boasts about the unemployment insurance. The kind of unemployment insurance that exists in the Amalgamated serves only the local cliques, not the great majority of the workers. Let me show you how. In New York each local union receives a sum of money for unemployment insurance. The local politicians will pay most of it to those who support the local machine. The average workers, in order to get unemployment insurance, must be in good standing as far as dues and assessments are concerned. When a worker is idle, how can he pay dues or assessments? So when he comes for his unemployment insurance, dues and assessments are deducted, so that nothing remains for the starving worker. Let Hardman deny this fact. . . .

One more point: "In the past years the Amalgamated has supported all efforts leading to a labor party"—well and good. But he forgot that they have endorsed Tammany's candidates (such as Lehman) and others in a quiet way. For Thomas they gave a banquet and then sent letters to the workers asking them to vote for Republican and Democratic candidates. . . .

I am not a fanatic who does not understand that the depression has affected the clothing industry just as it has any other industry. What I am driving at is that Hillman's coöperation with the employers has gone so far that he cannot see anything but the employers' point of view. For the last ten years he has preached that the industry comes first, just as John L. Lewis and Matthew Woll say my country comes first. A labor representative, when he is interested in behalf of the workers, must say, the workers come first, the employer will take care of his own business. This Hillman failed to do. Hillman's unionism is not business unionism. It is a trade-union capitalism.

Unfortunately, the outside world and the intellectuals still consider the Amalgamated a radical and progressive organization. The workers know better. Where do the intellectuals get their information? They go to lunches and dinners given by the employers in conjunction with the union officials. They interview Hillman, the president of the Clothing Manufacturers' Exchange, etc. This is how they get their information. Then they edit journals and claim that they give their readers facts, that they are the authorities on labor problems, also on research work. How can these people give facts when they were never in a shop and never investigated conditions? Hardman admitted that he was never in a New York shop. These professors or economists merely repeat what one person, Hillman, told them when they dined together. At least they should go into a few shops and interview employers and workers alike. If not, they ought to go into different union offices where workers assemble, talk to them, hear their grievances and sentiments. This I would call facts and research. Otherwise they merely deceive their readers. It is time [illegible] workers' story before they try to give

LICENSED TO JSTOR.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIR: (1) *"The Amalgamated was a fighting organization until 1921. Its last battle with the employers took place in the same year. . . . After this bitter struggle Hillman became a statesman, a chief, not a fighter for the cause and the interests of the workers."*

Oh, yeah? How about these few peaks, for instance?

(a) In 1925 the union waged a twenty weeks' strike against the International Tailoring Company of New York and Chicago. The fight cost the union over $600,000, and the company stated that it would not renew the agreement with the union until it spent $3,000,000 in the fight against the union. It did make peace.

(b) In 1928 the Adler Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a rich concern of seventy-five years' standing, locked out 750 union members. The lockout was countered with a strike which lasted six months, cost the union $300,000, resulted in the establishment of the union-owned clothing factory in that city and the liquidation of the Adler Company.

(c) In the summer and fall of 1929, in a series of brilliantly conducted strikes, the union finally organized the whole Philadelphia market of 10,000 workers, although during the previous ten years of continuous organizing efforts and strikes, more than a million dollars had been consumed in unsuccessful attempts to organize.

Perhaps the good correspondent will not deign to consider the Philadelphia and other cases as "a fight for the interest of the workers," but his sanction is of little consequence so long as the Philadelphia workers and the others are satisfied. Is it not necessary to name many other costly encounters in New York, Cleveland, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Boston, in the Canadian cities and over the vast area of open-shop territory? Moreover, are strikes the only criteria of union militancy?

(2) *"Hardman boasts about unemployment insurance, etc."*

But when, where? I wrote, in The New Republic of October 28:

> It was unavoidable that the A. C. W. of A. should be found among the leading advocates of unemployment insurance through state action and of economic planning. Its action has brought sympathetic response from the railway clerks, the locomotive engineers, the enginemen and firemen and from several other important labor groups.

No boast in that. My emphasis of the need of compulsory unemployment insurance cannot possibly be construed as an overestimate of voluntary insurance. One need not be an "expert statistician" to understand that contributions by employers to the extent of 1½ percent of their labor bill—or even 4½ percent, as is the case in Chicago—will at best take care of but a negligible percentage of the total number of unemployed in the industry. The system now in force was calculated to cope with unemployment caused by seasonal fluctuations and, to but a small degree, with technological displacement of labor. No one in his senses ever maintained that the present system could cope with mass unemployment caused by a national and international depression. However, no apologies need be made for the Amalgamated unemployment-insurance plan. It has been very effective within the limited confines of its stated purposes and it has helped greatly in placing the matter of unemployment insurance on the order of America's business.

(3) *"When he comes for his unemployment insurance, dues and assessments are deducted, so that nothing remains for the starving worker."*

This is generally untrue though, of course, it is not impossible that in single instances dues were collected where sound policy dictated leniency. By and large, unions must collect dues and assessments. Union-protected unemployment insurance would not live long if non-payment of dues was permitted to weaken or destroy the union, as it inescapably would. In New York, the fund was not inaugurated till 1928, and as no reserves were accumulated before the depression, no insurance benefits are now paid; only relief money is given to workers in need. When the machinery of automatically paying benefits to all does not function, it is unavoidable that the local executive boards direct the disbursement, and abuses are possible, oversights—surely. Every executive board is naturally enough a "local machine" and "politicians" to those who are not on the inside, and to a degree every a better way of dealing with such a problem than the ways of democracy, unless it be the undemocratic method.

(4) *"Hardman did not tell us there had been a change in working conditions under Hillman's regime since 1919."*

It would have been beside the point in my analysis of "Fifty Years of American Labor," of which the article on the Amalgamated was a part, to discuss specific trade conditions. I considered the movement not from the point of view of the depression of 1929-1932, but over a stretch of half a century. I selected the Amalgamated as representative of a certain type of unionism and a description of present-day conditions, bad as they might be, would neither add to nor detract from the pertinence of my conclusions. May I refresh the reader's memory by quoting the following passage in my article:

> Indeed, the Amalgamated of 1931 may be said to have declined in stature, in certain respects, since 1922; but then the labor movement as a whole is only a shadow of what it was ten years ago.

And further:

> The union, of course, has not achieved the millennium for its members, nor has it been able to stave off the present depression in the clothing industry. Nor is it suggested here that the national administration has not committed errors or that all local divisions have entirely escaped the major evil of American unionism, mismanagement.

I stand by what I wrote, and this is no blanket endorsement of all the things done in the union by numerous persons of consequence, but the decline of industrial and employment conditions since 1922 cannot be charged to the union. The men's clothing industry underwent great changes in the last ten years, and that prior to and independently of the general depression. It may not be common knowledge, for instance, that the widespread use of the automobile and the rise of the radio industry, both of which for a number of years generated prosperity among a large class of the people, had affected adversely the men's clothing industry. Perhaps family morals were strengthened by Sunday outings in the family "lizzie" and the domestic radio set may have kept men from "leaving home" too frequently, but the need for that extra suit of clothes for the holiday visiting went overboard and with it the clothing workers' prosperity. Mr. Hillman can no more be blamed for the scaling down of conditions in the men's clothing industry since 1922 than Mr. Hoover can be blamed for the warm weather which has hurt the tailors this winter. The great task of so guiding the union that the deflation should not diminish its power has been accomplished by the Amalgamated. In this connection, some persons who think they are radicals decry the introduction of union-production standards as a sign of the union's weakness or defeat. But no worker who understands ordinary shop-economics and who does not look solely for a political issue, will argue against union-regulated standardization of output. He knows that whether the basis of wages is piece work or the time unit, there exists everywhere and always a required standard of production. Though otherwise such a standard is concealed and is employer-made, the Amalgamated proposed standards of production openly arrived at by process of bargaining, so that the union may have a say in the matter.

Again, one word why I have selected the Amalgamated as an instance of the positive side of the American union scene, while I took the United Mine Workers' Union for the negative. Not at all because all is perfect in the one and all wrong in the other, but there is, in some ways, a similarity between the industrial problems which have confronted the clothing workers and the miners. In 1921 both these unions were at the peak of power and both had the largest number of members in their respective records. Both industries were greatly affected by post-war changes. Both suffered from overdevelopment and from undermanagement. But while the United Mine Workers of America is facing the present depression totally disintegrated, the A. C. W. of A. has retained its power practically intact. This difference is due to the respective effects of prosecuting a determined union policy on the one hand, and of drifting instead of following a policy on the other. The tailors in the shops, however bad their present-day working conditions are, know what it has meant to them to have retained a functioning union in the present depres-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manifesto to the Trade

WHEN INDUSTRIES are sick and cannot cure themselves, they turn to the bankers for diagnosis and remedy. Sometimes the bankers prescribe more vitamins and calories—more capital to be furnished by themselves—and everyone is happy. Sometimes they prescribe diet and exercise, in which case everyone argues about who shall diet, who exercise—and who is to blame anyhow—and who will pay the doctors' bill.

The National Association of Book Publishers, having decided in 1930 that its members were suffering not only from the depression, but also from the results of a disorganized condition existing for many years, requested Mr. O. H. Cheney of the Irving Trust Company to conduct an economic survey of the book industry. The findings of his committee have recently been published in a volume distributed to publishers, critics and others immediately concerned in the reforms which he suggests. The report should also be of interest, however, to the general public, since it does not treat book distribution as an isolated phenomenon. As the Cheney Committee says:

> In the conditions pictured in this report, the book industry is like every other American industry. . . . There is no consumer industry in this country which does not show as discouraging a record of blindness, planlessness, waste and inefficiency. . . . There is no industry which is not rotted and rusted through with old "trade practices" and malpractices and flawed through and through with new strains and ruptures caused by ignorance, foreblindness, inertia and competitive folly.

Neither individuals nor special departments of the book trade can rightly be held responsible for these evils: they are caused by competition. The Cheney survey may therefore be regarded as a general report on the competitive principle, as exemplified in that minor branch of American industry which happens to be the most self-conscious, articulate and intellectually important of all the branches.

Competition in the book trade begins before the book is written and does not end till the last battered copy of it appears on the ten-cent table in a second-hand furniture store. In the manufacturing side of the industry, for example, the struggle is so fierce that printers and binders are forced to assume, free of charge, the functions properly belonging to bankers, warehousemen and the publishers themselves.

Publishers compete with one another for the favor of authors, each striving to have a "well balanced" list—that is, a list so complete in every department of literature as to make the existence of any other publisher unnecessary. They compete with wholesalers for the privilege of selling to retail outlets. They compete with wholesalers and retailers together for the library trade. They compete with retailers once more by conducting mail-order sales campaigns and by opening bookstores of their own—a practice also followed by some of the wholesalers.

The bookstores, besides competing with publishers, wholesalers and one another, must also compete with department stores, drug stores, lending libraries, and those shops where "remainders" are sold for a third, a fifth or a tenth of the original price. At present the bookstores are in a precarious condition. But the fiercest competition—the one in which the percentage of survival is lowest—is among books themand for a minimum of attention from the house which issues them. The momentary success of one means the failure of many others; for "books," says the Cheney Report, "are cannibals."

The simple and inescapable result of this competition is that everybody loses. The manufacturers lose by quoting prices too low for honest workmanship. The publishers lose in terms of bad printing, bad binding and extra charges. They lose again by paying unreasonable advances to authors for whom they are competing, and by issuing, at a loss, books which should never be issued at all. They lose even more by competitive overselling, by overloading the retailers with new books and then being forced, in compensation, to offer special discounts and fantastic terms of credit. Meanwhile the bookstores are losing in the plainest manner possible, by going bankrupt.

Nor is this the end of the tally. The critics lose by having dumped on their hands a greater number of books than they can possibly judge or even accurately describe for their readers. The public loses by being asked to buy books on which nobody—not the publisher's advertising men, or the book reviewer, or the shop assistant who tells how vastly interesting it is—has formed an honest opinion. The public therefore hesitates. When it does buy a book, the price is higher than it would pay if the industry were efficiently managed. The case of the author is more complicated. If he is popular, he has the illusion of profiting from the bigger and bigger advance payments offered him by competing publishers. If he is unpopular, he can exult in the very publication of a book which, if the publishers were better organized, might never have seen the light. But what is the significance of publishing a book when the process consists merely in getting a half-read manuscript into type, running off a thousand copies, binding them flimsily, and forcing perhaps a third of them on unwilling booksellers, who promptly hide them under the counter? Essentially the fortune of an author is that of his book; and out of the many elements that enter into the publishing situation, it is the book which loses most of all: the editorial attention it deserves to receive, the chance of reaching the audience for which it was intended, the opportunity of living for more than a few dull or feverish months.

This picture, of course, is somewhat overdrawn. There are books which live for years instead of weeks, but they do so in spite of present conditions. There are many publishers and booksellers whose business is soundly conducted, but they must compete with—and pay for—the unsound practices of others. Everybody suffers; the whole industry is sick as the result of competition: such is the diagnosis of the bankers. What are the remedies they offer?

They do not go so far as to advise that competition be abolished, since this would be an unpractical, an unbanker-like solution. The Cheney Committee "paints no Utopia . . . and compounds no one-bottle panacea." Instead it offers dozens of specific recommendations for improving the different branches of the industry. These reforms fall into two general categories. Part of them can be applied by individual publishers, booksellers and manufacturers in their own business; the others are measures toward achieving a higher degree of "integration"—the fashionable word which is now replacing "coöperation" without essentially changing its meaning. The whole industry is encouraged to act collectively. And the first chapter of this manifesto to the trade ends with a sentence which the Cheney Committee might have borrowed from the works of a Jewish agitator whose theories are now receiving much attention.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

afraid to win as much as it has so long been willing to lose." It is exactly like saying, "Publishers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a world to win." But exactly what is the world that the publishing industry may win if it adopts Mr. Cheney's recommendations?

The reforms affecting individual houses would, and probably will, have an effect that is easy to calculate. They would place the firms which adopted them in a position to compete more effectively with those which remained disorganized. Thus, they would sharpen the struggle within the trade, and force the less efficient publishers and booksellers into bankruptcy.

The reforms which lead toward "integration" have somewhat less chance of being adopted, since they depend on collective action. Undoubtedly, if followed to the letter, they would strengthen the industry as a whole. They would also sharpen the competitive struggle, but in a broader field. They would give the book industry the means for competing—and force upon it the need for competing—with radio, movies, automobiles, candy, television, travel, interior decorating and all the other industries which must fight for the consumer's leisure hours and leisure dollars. They would make publishing even more dependent than at present upon changes in fashion and variations in purchasing power. They are not root-and-branch reforms, yet on the whole they are extremely desirable. For anything more effective, we must wait until society as a whole is better organized.

MALCOLM COWLEY.

Woodrow Wilson: A Retouched Portrait

Woodrow Wilson: Life and Letters, by Ray Stannard Baker. Vol. III: Governor, 1910-1913; vol. IV: President, 1913-1914. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 1,001 pages. $10.

MR. BAKER has been given the opportunity of producing the greatest biography of this generation. After all the excess of eulogy and abuse has been cleared away, his subject still stands forth as one of the three or four most important figures of world history during the past half century and one of the most important Americans of all time. The biographer has had at his disposal a mass of material which he himself describes as voluminous, and the most significant portion of which, Mr. Wilson's private letters, has never been published. Everyone in any way connected with the President has been anxious to contribute what information he possessed, in order that the record might be complete. Friends have provided letters of which no copies were retained in the Wilson files, anecdotal recollections, and advice as to arrangement.

Admitting the size and difficulty of the task devolving upon Mr. Baker, critical historians will insist, I think, that the results fall short of the opportunity. The present volumes bring together a vast amount of information, but they give us comparatively little pertaining to the President that was not known before; to a large extent they are a compilation and an interpretation of published material. The two volumes contain a thousand pages; but analysis reveals that the excerpts from Woodrow Wilson's letters and telegrams which are here printed amount altogether to about 110 pages. Barely one-ninth of the book is thus the unpublished *ipsissima verba* of the President for which tolls exemption, constitute a truly extraordinary record, the historian is [illegible] pretation of the man and his times, reprints of published addresses, and extracts from books written by others. The volumes are filled with such expressions as, "a close examination of the documents shows that . . . ," or "it is clear enough from the documents that . . . ," or "we find that. . . ." With all respect to the interpretative functions of the biographer, the student does not, in this instance at least, wish to be spared the duty of studying Wilson on his own behalf, and is hardly prepared to accept Mr. Baker's understanding of the documents in place of the documents themselves. Mr. Burton Hendrick in his "Life of Walter Hines Page" has set an example of permitting the subject of a biography to tell his own story in his own letters. The interposition of Mr. Baker as biographer between his subject and the reader is emphasized by recurrent mannerisms, repeated use of favorite adjectives and, especially, a constant succession of rhetorical questions and exclamatory sentences, often rather trite—"What changes the years bring!" "Another disappointment!" "He knew the enemy!" "People love audacity, decisiveness!" That Mr. Baker should write eulogistically of his hero is certainly to be expected, but it is disappointing that he should use his sources uncritically, making no clear distinction between the evidential value of letters or diaries and that of memoirs and recollections. Furthermore, it is at least questionable judgment, in view of the comparatively small amount of Wilson's letters published, to devote so much space as is given to those addressed to Mrs. Hulbert. They betray an introspective and sympathy-searching mood which deserves to be recorded, perhaps, but a truer portrait of Wilson might have been attained if they had been more generously balanced with letters less trivial in content and conceived in a more masculine tone.

Such criticism of the biographer's method and its application still leaves it true that this is the most important life of Wilson that can be written until all the documents used by Mr. Baker are open to historical research. The two volumes cover the years of political apprenticeship in New Jersey and the extraordinary triumph of national domestic legislation in 1913-1914. It is abundantly clear that the prestige which Wilson achieved as Governor was not the result of political strategy. It was due to his ability to give real expression to the popular demand for reform, a demand which he answered with extraordinary directness and zeal in pushing forward the legislative aspects of reform, and above all with outstanding skill as an orator. In New Jersey, as later, he was the prophet, approaching the problem from the standpoint of general principles before passing to details, principles which he knew how to make extremely attractive, brushing aside opposition by the force of courage and imagination. As Mr. Baker himself intimates, Wilson was always at his strongest in the early phases of a struggle, before the general principles lost their appeal and the unpleasant implications of detail became obvious. It had been so in the presidency of Princeton and the same was to be true of his national presidency. Much of his legislative accomplishment in New Jersey was later undone, but in his first sweeping attack upon a problem or series of problems he was irresistible.

This was preëminently true of his first year in the White House, the legislative results of which are reminiscent in their importance of the early sessions of Gladstone's first reform ministry. The Federal Reserve Act, the Tariff Act, the Clayton Anti-trust Act, the repeal of Panama

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal leadership of the finest sort. Wilson gave to it the same qualities, although exhibited on a larger stage and in higher development, which had brought success in New Jersey. But in meeting the national problems there was necessary another quality which at no time characterized Woodrow Wilson. The weakness of Mr. Baker's presentation, I think, is to be found in his assumption that the President possessed and furnished the political sagacity that was needed to push his measures through Congress. With all his courage and oratorical power, with all his capacity for reducing a complex problem to simple principles, legislative success would not have been possible without the acquiescence and aid of Bryan and his friends, nor without sagacious counsel as to the detailed arrangements that had to be made in order to win congressional support. But as Mr. Baker himself shows, Wilson was slow to appreciate the necessity of winning Bryan's assistance and it required strong pressure to persuade him to bring Bryan into the Cabinet, thereby gaining the assurance that his opposition from outside would not wreck the legislative program. It was also through the advisers who possessed valuable contacts with all shades of influential opinion that a comprehensive chart of the political situation was drafted for the President. With such a chart before him—and he could not have drawn it himself—Wilson was able to guide his legislation through the shoals and rocks of Congress and opinion which would otherwise, I suspect, have wrecked it.

This aspect of the Wilson administration is not emphasized by Mr. Baker. He pictures Colonel House, for example, as a well meaning and rather inept gentleman, whom the President suffered because of personal fondness, who never quite understood what the President wanted, and whose advice was disregarded. It is a picture quite the reverse of that drawn by impartial observers, such as Clemenceau, who spoke of House as the "window through which the light came to Wilson," or Ambassador Dumba, who refers to him as one who "had all the qualities which Wilson lacked." Nor is it a picture recognizable in the letters of the President to the Colonel, few of which are here published. No one would suggest that Colonel House framed the President's policies for him or revised their details; but the student will probably ask whether they would have been translated into legislative fact without his information and counsel. That Wilson was able to accept and utilize effectively such counsel has not always been recognized and is entirely to his credit.

The legislative success of the first year of the Wilson administration was not equaled in foreign affairs. Mr. Baker gives full value to the difficulties confronting the President in the Mexican situation, but even the friendliest treatment cannot resolve the confused struggle, almost personal in its nature, between Wilson and the Mexican President—which resulted in the Vera Cruz expedition, the flight of Huerta and the victory of Carranza—into a real diplomatic victory for the United States. Nevertheless, it was in this first year of his administration that President Wilson laid down in his Mobile speech the principles which he was later to develop into a positive international policy. The forbearance shown by Wilson in his dealings with Mexico and the proposal of arbitration by the A. B. C. Powers paved the way for the draft covenant of non-aggression between American nations, which both in language and in spirit pointed toward the Covenant of the League of Nations. With the development of this policy, presumably, succeeding volumes will be primarily concerned.

Policy or Knight-Errantry?

America's Siberian Adventure, 1918-1920, by Major General William S. Graves. New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. 387 pages. $3.50.

THE INTERNATIONAL situation of Russia, rarely very good under the Tsars, became infinitely worse after the Bolshevik revolution. Tsarism was hated, feared and universally recognized; but the Bolshevik upstarts are usurpers, an Ishmael among the nations, and everybody's hand has been against them. The Germans were first on the scene; by the treaty of Brest-Litovsk they annexed vast territories with a population of sixty millions. Even after Brest-Litovsk, they continued their eastward penetration until they were able to shake hands with their Turkish friends in the Caucasus. "Are they determined to strangle us?" was Lenin's cry of pain to Joffé, his Berlin ambassador. But a German publicist of the time explained that there was to be left only a "residue-Russia," the isolated central nucleus, with its thin soil and lack of natural resources, cut off from the seacoasts, and deprived of the fertile agricultural as well as the mineral-bearing lands.

After the Allied victory in the West, Allied troops took the place of the Germans in the territories the latter had occupied, besides occupying additional territories in the north, east and southeast. The Americans and British were in the Murmansk region. The Americans and Japanese were in eastern Siberia, where the Japanese, to the number of seventy or eighty thousand, penetrated as far as Lake Baikal. The British were in Central Asia and the Caucasus; having occupied all of Persia, they were aiming to extend their Indian empire to the Caspian and Black Seas. The British-Indian empire had been erected on the ruins of the Mogul empire; why not create a new British-Asian empire out of the visibly dissolving realm of the Tsars? The French, more modest in their aims, confined their efforts to the Ukraine, which bordered on Poland, their most important East-European ally, and in which considerable French capital had been invested in the metallurgical industries.

The British, French, Japanese were thus pursuing policies of so-called national advantage. But what were Americans doing in that galley? And in particular, what were they aiming at with their expedition in eastern Siberia? General Graves, who commanded the expedition, and who has now given us a detailed, honest, straightforward account of that "Adventure," does not know. Mr. Newton D. Baker, who writes a Foreword to General Graves's book, and who was Mr. Wilson's Secretary of War, is not quite certain about it either, though he intimates that the President was moved by diplomatic considerations, which he "refrains from discussing." But it is precisely because there was no clear motive for sending American troops into Siberia that General Graves's position was made so difficult and his course of action subjected to a stream of hostile criticism, not only by British, French and Japanese generals and statesmen, but also by the State Department in Washington and its representatives in Siberia.

General Graves's formal instructions were not to intervene in the internal affairs of the Russian people, and he strictly followed these instructions. When he was ordered to participate in guarding the railroad on which supplies were being forwarded to Kolchak, he carried out his orders, even though this was a violation of the formal policy, but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Japanese commander, the British and French generals, the representatives of the American State Department, exerted the utmost pressure on him to side with the counter-revolutionary forces, but he could not be budged, and he was supported in his stand by the Secretary of War as well as by the chief of the general staff, General March. But why this conflict between the two government departments, and what were their respective policies? The point is precisely that our government had no policy, that our troops were sent to Russia on a fool's errand, and that some officials in the State Department, in their hatred of Bolshevism (which was not necessarily objective and disinterested), were trying to make America subserve British, French and Japanese imperialist policies. Anti-Bolshevism is not and cannot be a national policy, whether of America or of any other Power, in her international relations, any more than anti-monarchism or anti-Fascism can be a national policy; it is a social creed, which may be applied at home by statesmen with a passion for that sort of thing, and a sufficient police force at their disposal; but it must of necessity stop at the frontier. Carried beyond the frontier, it ceases to be policy, and, as every reader of General Graves's book will conclude, becomes mere knight-errantry. HERMAN SIMPSON.

Shoddy and Pure Wool

The Literary Mind: Its Place in an Age of Science, by Max Eastman. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 343 pages. $2.50.

MR. MAX EASTMAN is an amusing and provocative critic: his study of the literary mind tempts one to write a whole treatise demolishing his errors and half-judgments and reaffirming with even greater emphasis the sound parts of his analysis. Setting out to examine the function of literature in a scientific age, he makes the initial mistake of assuming that science and literature were originally one, and that the growth of tested knowledge in our day has, step by step, pushed literature to one side. There is no ground for this belief: Euclid and Menander, Chaucer and Albertus Magnus, Milton and Robert Boyle, were no more and no less separated than James Joyce and Einstein today: science would displace literature only if their functions and ends were the same—and, in the latter half of his book, Mr. Eastman himself handsomely demonstrates how different they are. In order to prove his case, Mr. Eastman cites the vague and loose pronouncements of various contemporary critics on the nature of literature, and in this very argument he falls victim to the habit he castigates: for any sensible pronouncement on the function of literature must be based upon a first-hand study of the way it acts and works, not upon the way other critics may imagine it acts and works.

In dealing with "The Cult of Unintelligibility," Mr. Eastman says some intelligent things about the act of communication: but he forgets to note, as a good scientific critic should, that most of these things were stated with even more point by Tolstoy in "What Is Art?" in his criticism of the Symbolists. In the chapters on "What Poetry Is" and "Art and Biology," Mr. Eastman happily turns his back upon his original premises and establishes literature as an autonomous function of the personality, seeking to hold and intensify and explore and expand the actualities and the possibilities of experience: these chapters are equaled only by his all-too-brief note on I. A. Richards' "Psychology of Poetry," in which Mr. Eastman is at his best. In sum, "The Literary Mind" is a teasing weave of shoddy and pure wool. It lacks the tough consistency of Mr. Kenneth Burke's "Counter-Statement," and in those parts of his argument where Mr. Eastman is strong, Mr. Burke is usually even stronger. LEWIS MUMFORD.

A Shy Communicant

The Life of Dostoevsky, by Edward Hallett Carr. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 331 pages. $3.50.

SINCE 1921, with the Soviet government assisting, a great deal of new Dostoevsky material has been brought to light. This new biography by Mr. Carr, an English diplomat, has had the advantage of it, and his publishers do not hesitate to call the book "definitive." Those who have studied the subject will find some interesting new items here. There is a chance, however, that readers who have received much from Dostoevsky's novels will be antagonized by this biography. It seems to gloat over the apparent duplicities of his nature, to seize every opportunity for fault-finding and ridicule. It is superior in tone and stringent beyond reason. But all this is merely a pose on Mr. Carr's part; underneath he is more amiable than he seems. Beneath his pose of critical severity he shows a wistful affection for Dostoevsky, as though he needed something that Dostoevsky had to give.

His book can be recommended as a clear and fairly comprehensive account of Dostoevsky's life. As an interpretation, however, it is valuable only because its mistakes are typical. Mr. Carr is not a good critic, though he scoffs at critics like Merezhkovsky and Gide. The real reason why his book is called definitive, I suspect, is that its opinions are thoroughly conventional. In fact, since the competition is limited, it may be the most complete museum of generally accepted, erroneous notions about Dostoevsky. (Perhaps that is why it is being hailed as "the best book on him . . . in any language.") Mr. Carr sneers at Freud's "Dostoevsky and Parricide." There is much that is questionable in that paper; but even its errors, the errors of genius, are more valuable than these "truths," the half-truths of journalism.

It is not easy to summarize Mr. Carr's position because he refuses to come to grips with essentials, dismissing the most important problems all too superciliously. Briefly, it might be said that he thinks Dostoevsky should be regarded not as a visionary or prophet, but simply as an artist. Now this "truth" is very popular and very dangerous. It seems an excellent simplification to confine Dostoevsky's novels strictly to the category of art. By doing this we rule out "metaphysics," which is the current expression for anything that has to do with the soul. We feel that we know something about art; about the soul, nothing. But criticism is in a dangerous state when it feels better able to cope with literature than with life. The instant we proceed to criticize in this fashion we find that the author whom we are dissecting has turned into a corpse. Moreover, in Dostoevsky's case, it happens that his novels were so written that when we rule out the soul we rule out everything. The soul is their inner reality, without which they have no meaning. It is as vain to seek to interpret Dostoevsky while denying this inner reality as it would be to seek to interpret Marx while denying the existence of a class war.

In discountenancing the "religious element" in Dostoevsky's work, while admiring it esthetically, Mr. Carr is representative of a great many others. In reality these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people are not the stern critics they pretend to be, for if Dostoevsky were to be judged strictly esthetically he would be far less important than he is. How are we to explain his lack of balance, his lack of simplicity, his lack of restraint? These are unquestionably esthetic defects. Judged from another standpoint, it is true, they are not defects at all, because it is only too obvious that his spiritual message, which no writer has ever surpassed in depth, could not have been delivered without them. But what is this other standpoint? It is not esthetic, it is religious. Because he so deeply satisfies our religious sense of truth we do not insist upon our esthetic sense of proportion; in fact we allow him to give us a new sense of proportion. It is the religious element in his work, finally, that justifies and creates everything. Why does he receive more attention today than Turgenev, an artist who appeals more specifically to our esthetic sense? Precisely because of the religious element; because Dostoevsky gives the hungry modern audience a spiritual nourishment which it gets very seldom now, which is denied to it by what, classically speaking, may be better art. I wonder if the hunger that brought Mr. Carr to Dostoevsky was as esthetic as he thinks. At times he suggests a shy communicant who steals to the back door of art for religion. If he tends to emphasize the form of Dostoevsky's novels it may be simply because he is unwilling to admit that his soul—a word which no one likes to say nowadays—has been fed by the content.

GERALD SYKES.

Mirror of Girlhood

The Getting of Wisdom, by Henry Handel Richardson. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. $2.50.

MISS RICHARDSON, who has written "Maurice Guest" and "The Fortunes of Richard Mahony," a trilogy dealing richly with life in that Australia "sometimes called Felix," now presents, in the revision of an early book, a different, simpler drawing of the same place and time, a drawing with but a single figure. It is as if, upon going into that full furnished room of her mind which has supplied her with all her rich materials, she had approached a mirror, and looking into it had seen the road that runs into the distance, that runs back. And looking down that road she evoked the figure of a young girl, unblurred by distance, a girl with "sharp, unkind eyes" who went to a boarding school in Melbourne, and made there all the mistakes of pride, eagerness and timidity. It is a dispassionate record, except for one passage toward the end of the story combining tenderness and prophecy.

In the same light and vibrant atmosphere which distinguishes Katherine Mansfield's "At the Bay," Laura, oldest of four children, is the rebellious and dominant personality of a home at once well bred and poor. Girllike, she is ashamed of her mother's professional sewing which is to earn tuition for her in a private school. Then, as a rigorous system strikes in one unhappy detail after another upon her sensitiveness, we are given a picture of the old-time girls' school with all its cruelties, boredom, infatuations and difficult lessons totally unrelated to the world in which these pupils will live as women.

At first Laura is unwittingly pert, then bewildered and silent, until the brief season of her blossoming. Social weekend encounters with boys have failed—they simply are not interested by her desperate and trembling politeness. "Since, however, it seemed that someone had to be loved, then it was easier, infinitely easier, to love the curate." With nothing more to go on than a visit to his household, where he is revealed as an overworked, underfed, cantankerous man, she nevertheless constructs an elaborate, savory romance which she throws to the delighted girls "just as the beset traveler throws whatever he has at hand to the ravenous wolves that press round the sled." When at last the fiction is discovered, Laura is socially banished, and only redeemed from her abject loneliness by a passionate, jealous friendship with an older girl.

The school year ebbs, the annual concert comes, Speech Day, dispersal into the unfamiliar outer world. "Once more that lambkin called Laura saw fit to sunder itself from the flock, and to cut mad capers in sight of them all"—running down the road, a half-grown girl in white, running free, becoming again the figure seen by her creator in a mirror of her own life.

One cannot resist matching Laura with that other *rara avis,* the Claudine of Colette, and commenting that this school at least was not marked by the enormities of cheating and scandal of French provincial *pensions* of the same epoch. Miss Richardson on the same theme is at once more sensitive, more economical, soberer, less clever, less seductive, than Colette. Her book is a valued addition to the literature of adolescence.

HAZEL HAWTHORNE.

Book Notes

ART

LES METAMORPHOSES D'OVIDE, translated into French by George Lafaye. *Illustrated with 30 original etchings by Pablo Picasso. New York: Marie Harriman Gallery. $400, $700 and $1,200.*

This quarto volume comes from the presses of Leon Pichon; some copies are printed upon paper hand-made by the Papeteries d'Arches, and others upon white Imperial Japanese vellum; the type used is Caslon Elzevir XVI; copies at $700 have a duplicate series of the thirty etchings, and those at $1,200 have, in addition to these, an original drawing by Picasso. But these are such details as bibliophiles feed upon. The wider appeal will be made by the illustrations; the greater curiosity and interest will be as to the nature and quality of the Picasso etchings: just how would the most famous of living artists illustrate the book? As those familiar with his work might have expected, Picasso has captured the spirit of the "Metamorphoses" and has let the letter go. In subject matter these etchings are but distantly related to Ovid's romantic tales. In treatment, however, they emphasize the qualities that have made Ovid entertaining for over two thousand years. They are swift and lyrical, light and sensuous; and there is a fullness and richness about them that escapes first sight, due to the limpid simplicity and easy assurance of the outline method here employed. Many will find this series more acceptable, because more to a purpose, than the larger Pompeianesque drawings exhibited in New York a few years ago.

THE RUSSIAN IKON, by N. P. Kondakov. *New York: S. J. Bolan, agent. Two albums of reproductions and two volumes of text in Russian and French. $100 the set.*

Researches into the history and artistic value of the Russian ikon have been carried on simultaneously in Moscow by the Soviet government and in Prague by Professor N. P. Kondakov and his White Russian associates. The fruits of the former researches were presented last year in the loan exhibition of ikons shown at museums throughout the country. This exhibition proved, to antiquarians and dilettantes, that the ikons were being carefully restored and preserved by the Soviet authorities, and were not really in the hands of barbarians. To the general public, it was the revelation of a period of art on the same level of importance as late medieval painting in Italy and Flanders. The latter impression is reenforced by Professor Kondakov's monumental work,

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Seminarium Kondakovianum. It is in four volumes, the first consisting of 65 reproductions in color, and the second of 136 phototypes. The third volume, and the fourth (which has not yet appeared), contain a long monograph in Russian with a French summary, as well as many additional illustrations. Professor Kondakov, who was the first real authority on ikons, traces their development from the twelfth to the seventeenth century, showing first the Byzantine influences, then the Italian, and finally the flowering of an indigenous tradition during the sixteenth century, at a time when painting in Russia was as rich, pure and eloquent as any the world has known.

UNDERSTANDING MODERN ART, by Morris Davidson. *New York: Coward-McCann. 243 pages, illustrated. $4.*

Just as the art student has to unlearn or forget most of what is taught him in the art schools, so the persevering layman bent on understanding modern art will have to forget nearly all the contents of this book. Like most attempts at popularization, the present volume, although honest and well meaning, suffers at once from oversimplification and the tendency to formula-making. The illustrations are well chosen but poorly reproduced.

Biography and Memoirs

GANDHI AT WORK: More of His Own Story, edited by Charles F. Andrews. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 406 pages. $2.50.*

Mr. Andrews, Gandhi's biographer and interpreter, continues his story of the Mahatma's life in this third and last volume of the series. The basis of his account is Gandhi's own writings, "Satyagraha in South Africa," "My Experiments with Truth" and "Hind Swaraj." The period here covered is from 1893, when Gandhi, a barrister-at-law, arrived in South Africa on legal business, until 1914, when, after an exhausting struggle, the Indians there achieved a measure of political recognition. Gandhi had come to South Africa on a temporary mission, but the plight of his people moved him and he stayed on, making their cause his life work. This period of Gandhi's life was likewise a desperate battle against the forces of oppression. The weapon that the Mahatma found was adopted passionately by his adherents, who included virtually all the South African Indians—it was Satyagraha, moral resistance without force, a watchword that became a religion for the Indians, a martyrdom. Satyagraha, however, does not imply that Gandhi was a passive resister in a negative sense: he was the leader in an aggressive crusade for truth and justice at all costs, even death.

The situation in South Africa was grim. Indians, indentured for five years, were brought over to work the flourishing plantations. Their condition was virtual slavery. As Gandhi saw, and as he himself experienced, imprisonment, beatings, every type of injustice; as he discovered the broken pledges, the evasions, the subterfuges of government officials, the outright corruption in some cases of underlings, his conviction grew that only an unfaltering principle of resistance, along peaceful lines, could ultimately achieve his aims. That these aims were achieved is due primarily to the Mahatma, but the devotion of his followers must be placed side by side with the leader's tenacity.

The book, though written with quiet restraint, contains thunderous matter. There are pages that implicitly are blood red and dolorous, as if torn from some ancient chronicle, from Jordanes' annals of the Goths. In effect, this volume is an indictment of the inhumanity of civilized government.

Public Questions

RECENT TRENDS IN AMERICAN HOUSING, by Edith Elmer Wood. *New York: The Macmillan Company. 317 pages, illustrated. $3.*

An indispensable book for anyone who wishes to form an intelligent opinion upon housing in America. Dr. Wood has gone into the subject from every angle, even the relationship of housing to city planning and regional planning; and she is particularly good in dealing with essential aspects of the problem which even during periods of "prosperity" of providing any sort of new accommodations of decent standards for more than half of our present population. Her courage, her clarity and her happy freedom from cant make this book a landmark in the literature of the housing movement.

Fiction

THE BIG WEDDING, by Olav Duun. *Translated from the Norwegian by Arthur G. Chater. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.*

The third volume in a long saga, this novel is similar in treatment and style to many in the Scandinavian—particularly the Hamsun—tradition. But a new note has crept into the rustic melody. Duun's clods are frustrate, tortured by introspection, agonized by doubt. They idly pine for somebody to "take the parish on his back and carry it along"; there are no "folk who believe something and want something."—"Surely there'll be *one* of us some day who'll have something in him," is said without conviction. In the midst of this hopelessness two sisters wage a petty but deadly earnest battle for prestige in the parish. A good part of the book is devoted to a double wedding involving the daughter of one sister and the son of the other.

MR. DARBY, by Martin Armstrong. *New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.*

Mr. Darby was blissfully unconscious of his timid soul and his comically plump figure. Away from his wife Sarah, who treated him like a child, he could stretch his very elastic imagination all over the ends of the earth, picture himself an explorer, or do all sorts of pretty tricks with his personality. The author introduces him at the age of fifty and then, with a Victorian leisure that spreads over some four hundred pages, takes us through the odd adventures Mr. Darby blundered into after his uncle died and left him enough money to carry out the wildest dreams of all the Mr. Darbys in the world. In its closing chapters the novel disappoints somewhat by suddenly swerving from pleasant comedy to shocking fantasy, but it is all unusually good entertainment.

Contributors

James Rorty, Connecticut homesteader, free-lance writer and formerly a copywriter in a national advertising agency, is at present writing a book on advertising.

Martha Keller, a graduate of Vassar, was formerly publicity and advertising director for G. P. Putnam's Sons and at present occupies the same position with J. B. Lippincott and Company.

Matthew Josephson, who was closely connected with the Dada and Surrealist movements in France during their early days, is the author of a life of Zola, and of a critical biography of Rousseau which has just been published under the imprint of Harcourt, Brace.

Moe Bragin, who worked several years as a farmhand, has contributed to The Hound and Horn, The New Masses, Poetry, Pagany, etc., and is at present completing a book of farm stories.

Charles Seymour, professor of History at Yale since 1918, is the author among other books of "The Intimate Papers of Colonel House," which was published in four volumes by Houghton Mifflin and Company.

Herman Simpson, who was formerly an editor of The New York Call, has contributed extensively to The Bookman, The Independent and other magazines.

Lewis Mumford, author of a number of volumes on social, literary and architectural subjects, recently published "The Brown Decades," a study of the thirty years following the Civil War.

Gerald Sykes, who was born in the province of Ontario of American parents, has contributed to the second and third "American Caravans" and to various weekly and monthly magazines.

Hazel Hawthorne, at present free-lancing in New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MOTION PICTURE

FIRST SOVIET SOUND FILM WITH ENGLISH TITLES
A DRAMA OF RUSSIA'S "WILD CHILDREN"

ROAD TO LIFE

Prologue by JOHN DEWEY
Professor Emeritus of Columbia University

RKO CAMEO 42d St. & B'way 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. 25c

THEATERS

THE THEATRE GUILD presents EUGENE O'NEILL'S Trilogy
Mourning Becomes Electra
Composed of 3 plays
Homecoming, The Hunted, The Haunted
All 3 plays are presented on the same day, commencing at 5:30 sharp. Dinner intermission of one hour at 7:00.
No matinee performances
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
REUNION IN VIENNA
A Comedy by Robert E. Sherwood
MARTIN BECK Theatre, 45th St. & 8th Ave. PE—6-6100
Evenings, 8:40. Matinees Thursday, Saturday, 2:40

LECTURE

SCOTT NEARING
Why Are Times Hard?
LABOR TEMPLE, 242 East 14th Street
February 2, at 8 P.M. 25 and 50 cents

Addressed
Primarily to Chicagoans

A total stoppage of appropriations has compelled the Chicago Public Library to cancel its subscriptions to The New Republic for the year 1932. Heretofore seven copies have been available to readers in the Main Library and one copy in each of the forty-seven branches.

From time to time generous individuals who admire The New Republic send us the cost of a subscription to be donated to a library, not financially able to subscribe. At the moment we have in the office one such donation—a six-months' subscription, paid for by a reader in Philadelphia.

We hope that it will give no offense for us to offer this subscription to the Chicago Library, as we intend doing. And this most unusual incident suggests that others—primarily Chicagoans—might, for the sake of keeping copies of The New Republic in their customary places in the city's libraries, desire to donate subscriptions to restore those cancelled.

A special rate will be offered to any who respond. Those interested should communicate with:

Circulation Manager, The New Republic,
421 West 21st Street, New York.

BENEFIT

AMERICAN ORT BENEFIT
(To aid the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe)
Metropolitan Opera House, Washington's Birthday Matinee, Feb. 22nd, at 2 P. M.
"LA JUIVE"
Rachel: ELIZABETH RETHBERG
Eleazar: GIOVANNI MARTINELLI
Dress Circle, $4.00; Orchestra Circle, $5.00 and $6.00; Orchestra, $7.50; Box Seats, $7.50, $10.00 and $12.50.
Mail Reservations to
WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION AMERICAN ORT
220 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Telephone: AShland 4-6684

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE
AT COOPER UNION
8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 29
DR. RICHARD McKEON
"Roger Bacon; Science and God."

Sunday, January 31
DR. HOUSTON PETERSON
"Types of Victorian Agnosticism: Herbert Spencer."

Tuesday, February 2
PROFESSOR SHIRLEY QUIMBY
"Magnetism."

MUHLENBERG BRANCH LIBRARY
209 West 23rd St., 8:30 o'clock

Thursday, February 4
PROFESSOR E. G. SPAULDING

Mary De Nio-Teacher of Speech
Corrective Courses for Defective Speech
English for Foreigners
Studio: 601 W. 110th St. New York City
Telephone: Cath. 8-9846.
Saturday and Sunday or Evenings after 6 o'clock.

MAGAZINE

Are you a Nudist? Learn about the free culture movement. Send 10c for sample copy of Nudist Magazine. We also invite manuscripts and correspondence. David Livingston, 39-18 49th St., Sunnyside, L. I.

TRAVEL

23,000 SATISFIED CLIENTS
Foremost Student Tours: 250 all expense tours, 26 to 93 Days, $235 to $690: Small parties. First class Hotels. More motor travel. New Tourist Cabin. Organized Entertainment. Send for booklet.
COLLEGE TRAVEL CLUB
154 BOYLSTON ST., BOSTON, MASS.

RESORT

Are you looking for a place to rest or work? Take a mid-winter vacation in our country home. Warm, attractive rooms, southern cooking, delightful open fires. Golf (no fees) walk in the woods, lounge in the sun.
MAJOR MARSHALL MACDONALD,
Media Farm
Charles Town, Jefferson Co., W. Va.
Rates: $15 a week and up

POSITIONS WANTED

Young Man would like responsible secretarial position, requiring initiative and adaptability. Preferably literary work but not essential. Free to travel. Address: Box 651, The New Republic.

FOR RENT

Two unfurnished rooms, steam heat, fireplace, in remodeled house owned by The New Republic. Telephone: CHelsea 3-8393.

TYPING

MANUSCRIPTS expertly and carefully typed, at moderate rates. Box 647. The New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED